BINDING SECT. JUL 4 - 1968

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/caseagainstsocia00londuoft

THE CASE AGAINST SOCIALISM

GEORGE ALLEN
PUBLISHER
LONDON
156 CHARING CROSS ROAD
RUSKIN HOUSE

THE CASE AGAINST SOCIALISM

A HANDBOOK FOR SPEAKERS AND CANDIDATES

WITH PREFATORY LETTER BY

THE RIGHT HON. A. J. BALFOUR

11305-9
301-11

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & SONS
156, CHARING CROSS ROAD
1908

[All rights reserved]

Printed by Ballantyne, Hanson & Co.
At the Ballantyne Press, Edinburgh

PREFATORY LETTER

4 Carlton Gardens, Pall Mall, S.W.
6th March 1908.

My dear Captain Jessel,

I am glad that the London Municipal Society is devoting its attention to producing a Handbook upon Socialism.

The controversy with which it proposes to deal is one vital to the welfare of society, and it has now come down from the study of the theorist to the market-place and the street corner. No greater service can be rendered to the cause of ordered progress than a statement, at once careful and popular, of the main points in the dispute. This I understand to be the object which the London Municipal Society has had in view in preparing the present volume, and it has my heartiest sympathy.—Believe me, yours sincerely,

ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	Introductory Chapter	1
II.	Socialism in the United Kingdom	9
III.	The Revolutionary Nature of Socialism	87
IV.	International and Anti-National Character of Socialism	119
V.	The Socialist State	135
VI.	Progress or Reaction?	167
VII.	Liberty and Equality	204
VIII.	The Socialist Theory of Management	243
IX.	Socialist Fallacies	257
X.	Socialism and Religion	336
XI.	Woman under Socialism	372
XII.	Socialism and the Family	399
XIII.	Socialism and the Defensive Forces	411
XIV.	Socialism and the Land	429
XV.	Socialism and Agriculture	474
XVI.	Socialism and the Railways and Mines	496
XVII.	Conclusions	525
	INDEX	531

Economic rights form the bulwark of
human liberties

I

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

It is shown in subsequent portions of this work (see chapter ii. p. 51) that the Socialist societies in this country are divided into Evolutionary and Revolutionary bodies. None the less the differences in the Socialism for which they are to-day contending are, in point of fact, merely differences of degree. There are distinctions in the machinery and methods which they are prepared to employ, but they possess, at any rate, a common root principle in their Socialism. Thus it happens that the definition of Socialism which is accepted by the Revolutionary Social Democratic Party is equally acceptable to the Evolutionary Fabians and the Independent Labour Party. No orthodox Socialist in Great Britain will therefore demur to the following definition. The object of the Socialists of all parties is: "The Socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange to be controlled by a democratic State in the interest of the entire community, and the complete emancipation of labour from the domination of capitalism and landlordism, with the establishment of social and economic equality between the sexes."

With this mere definition of ultimate aims,

agreement between the various Socialist bodies ends. Collective ownership, as distinguished from private competing ownership, is in the case of all Socialistic organisations the ultimate goal. The Evolutionary Socialists, on the one hand, would work slowly and gradually through Municipalisation and Nationalisation until ultimately the real Socialisation was attained. They are content to realise their aims by instalments, and such are indeed their methods to-day. Above all, they are ever solicitous of the apprehensions of their weaker brethren, and proclaim their readiness to make compensation, in a limited measure, for what they take. It should never be forgotten, however, that the ultimate aim of all these societies is the most complete Socialism. They seek the entire abolition of private property in the land and in the means of production generally, and of distribution and exchange. Their Socialism is all the more dangerous for the reason that the last act is suppressed in their popular representations.

The Social Democratic Party, and the Revolutionary Socialists generally, are at present infinitely less of a menace in that they are admirably frank in regard to their aims and objects. In their eyes what we call property is theft, and they flatly decline to compound what they believe to be a felony by dangling any bait of compensation before faltering adherents. Nor have they anything but disgust for the evolutionary tactics of Socialism by instalments. They demand everything for their State ; they demand it now, and they proclaim a revolution as the only method of attainment.

Thus when the Evolutionary Socialists assert that

Socialism means little more than municipal milk and, it may be, municipal coal (realising that we already have municipal tramways and the like), this Socialism comes to us in a familiar guise. These municipal services are, however, merely steps in the advance. Evolutionary Socialism, in its complete and predestined programme, involves of necessity subversive changes which, in their social and economic aspects, fall in no way short of those designed by the Social Democrats themselves.

The catch-vote opportunism of the Evolutionary Socialist societies of Great Britain is sufficiently exposed by a statement of their officially described aim and objects. Thus we find that the Fabian Society "aims at the re-organisation of society by the emancipation of land and industrial capital from individual and class ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit" (see Fabian Tract, No. 7, p. 19).

The Independent Labour Party, in its Constitution and Rules (1907–8), declares as its object: "An Industrial Commonwealth founded upon the Socialisation of Land and Capital."

Mr. Blatchford's *Clarion* Fellowship organisations have aims which are equally wide-reaching. In *Britain for the British* (p. 84), Mr. Robert Blatchford writes: "Now, here in plain words is the *principle*, or root idea, on which *all* Socialists agree—That the country, and all the machinery of production in the country, shall belong to the whole people (the nation), and shall be used *by* the people and *for* the people."

The "principle, or root idea, on which all Socialists agree" cannot be too frequently insisted upon. Truth

to say, the Evolutionary Socialists are at present enlisting the larger share of their adherents by means of the crafty veiling of their ultimate aims. With two sweeping fallacies they appeal with an extraordinary measure of success to men and women who desire social reform. These fallacies should be forthwith exposed by the opponents of Socialism. The *first* is that those who are opposed to Socialism must necessarily be wholly satisfied with existing conditions, and must regard all reforms as being superfluous. The *second* is that the sole remedy for social evils is to be found in Socialism, and in Socialism alone.

Distinctions between "Socialism," "Social Democracy," and "Communism"

In all Socialist and anti-Socialist writings and speeches the words "Socialism," "Social Democracy," "Communism," and "Collectivism" now so constantly occur that some attempt must here be made to define them.

So far as the terms "Socialism" and "Social Democracy" are concerned, these in practice are to-day convertible terms. The latter is possibly in Great Britain even now less used than the former. This is due probably to its more recent introduction and to its German origin. The Social Democratic Party of Great Britain, both by means of its name and literature, has, however, done much to popularise the use of the word "Social Democracy."

The distinction between "Communism" and "Collectivism," and the relation of "Collectivism"

to "Socialism," is made sufficiently clear by the following quotations from Professor Flint's admirable chapter entitled "Communism, Collectivism, and State Intervention." [1]

"The two chief forms of Socialism are Communism and Collectivism."

"Communism is related to Socialism as a species to its genus. All Communists are Socialists, but all Socialists are *not* Communists." [2]

Communism represents, in short, a *voluntary* association of individuals who agree that their property, or, at all events, most forms of property, shall be held by them in common.

"Communistic societies have existed in nearly every land, and have appeared in almost all ages of the world." [3]

During past centuries it is religious Communism which has played the chief part. It is, perhaps, only in the nineteenth century "that Communistic societies," so states Professor Flint, "have been formed as solutions of the industrial and social problem." [4]

"Communism, however, is now generally regarded as an effete and undeveloped form of Socialism." It is to Collectivism we accordingly now turn.

This is the "kind of Socialism most in repute at present." Not only this, but it is also the only kind of Socialism at present "really formidable."

Collectivism differs from Communism in that the former "cannot be carried into practice by the

[1] See *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, pp. 55–100. The whole of this chapter is deserving of the closest study.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 55. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 55, 56. [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 56, 57.

voluntary action of individuals, or illustrated by experiments on a small scale. It is the Socialism which *can only be realised through the State, and which must have a whole nation as a subject on which to operate.*" Its leading principles comprise "the government of all by all and for all, with private property largely or wholly abolished, landowners got rid of, capital rendered collective, industrial armies formed under the control of the State on co-operative principles, and work assigned to every individual and its value determined for him."[1]

In view of the foregoing, it is scarcely necessary to emphasise that it is with *Collectivism* that we propose to deal in the present work.

How Socialists Define Capital

The Fabian Society represents largely the Intellectuals of the Socialist movement in Great Britain, and supplies definitions which are accepted in the main by all the denominations. The Fabian definition of capital is in general use. It is given on p. 1 of Fabian Tract, No. 1, as follows: "The sum of our instruments of production and of the advantages of the work of former years."

This definition, however, takes no account of the personal equation. Money and the inanimate instruments of production form only a small part of capital. The important capital of a country is to be found in Brains and Muscle *plus* the *Will* to employ them productively. Money, after all, is only the

[1] *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, pp. 61 and 62.

currency of capital; the Will and Strength and Ability to produce make up the real thing.

The Socialists imagine that when they have taken the means of production, such as the land and the industrial concerns, out of private ownership they will have attained the millennium. Yet these things are inanimate and wholly unproductive in themselves. It would be more accurate to describe them as the accessories of production rather than the means. The real means are the Will-force and the Brain-force and the Life-force of the producers, and the crux of Socialist practicability is the answer to the question, "Will these essential forces give of their best as fully and as productively under Socialism as they do under the present system?"

If they do *not*, our productivity will be diminished, and as the result we should be placed as a nation on short commons. The Socialists do not merely beg this question and assume that these forces will work as well under Socialism as under the present system, but they even assure us that they will yield better results than ever. How wholly opposed to all human probability is this arbitrary and sweeping assumption on the part of Socialists will be made apparent during the course of the present inquiry.

Socialism not merely an Economic System

Of late we have had passionate protests from the Evolutionary Socialists in this country against the charges that Socialism in its full development will result in unbelief and in immorality. That such effects should be anticipated by Socialists themselves

alone proves that the opponents of Socialism have ground for their apprehensions. Upon this point the following extract from a quite recent work by the well-known Socialist, Mr. Belfort Bax, is well deserving of consideration :—

"The saying of Tridon, subsequently repeated by Bebel and others, to the effect that Socialism stands for a system of life and thought expressing itself in economics as Communism, in politics as Republicanism, and in religion as Atheism, embodies in a few words a large measure of truth. It may be convenient for Socialists, with a view to election expediency, to seek to confine the definition of Socialism to the economic issue abstracted from all the other issues of life and conduct. But the attempt to limit the term Socialism within the four walls of an economic definition is, in the long run, futile. Such a limitation is justified neither by historic usage, nor, as above pointed out, by the implications involved in the economic change itself." [1]

[1] *Socialism: What It is and What It is not*, by Mr. E. Belfort Bax. Published 1907, p. 11.

II

SOCIALISM IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

Its Rise and Present Forces

Many have so long regarded Socialism as a plant which was unable to take root and flourish in England, that they even now fail to grasp the significance of the successes which are beginning to follow on the long and active campaign which Socialists have now carried on for several years in this country. Yet there are few soils in which greater dangers actually threaten to accompany the growth of Socialism.

Mr. Onslow Yorke, in his *Secret History of the International*, publishes one of the confidential documents issued some years ago by a leader of the International Society. In this it was urged that the headquarters of the Society should be removed to London, on the ground that "England is the only country in which a real Socialist revolution can be made." England, the writer of this document stated, is the one country in which the landed property has fallen into the fewest hands. "It is the one country in which a vast majority consists of people paid by wages. It is the one country where the war of classes and the

organisation of trades-unions have acquired a certain degree of maturity."

Let it not be thought that Socialism in this country has grown up in a single night—as is too commonly supposed. Its advancement has been most cunningly engineered, and the numerous British Socialist societies, with their countless branches, have been patiently devoting themselves to energetic "spade work" for years past.

Socialism in the United Kingdom Prior to 1880

In tracing the rise of Socialism in the United Kingdom, it is unnecessary for present purposes to attempt to go back in any detail beyond the early '80's. Mr. Sidney Webb, the Socialist writer, in writing about the year 1889, states that ". . . the present Socialist movement there" (*i.e.* in England), "as a conscious popular agitation of any vitality, is scarcely more than eight years old. . . ." [1] This statement, consequently, would place the date at about the year 1881. This statement on the part of Mr. Webb may be accepted. It must *not*, of course, be assumed that no trace of Socialism existed in England before this period. As Mr. Webb himself proceeds to state ". . . progressive Socialism in English politics dates from the very beginning of the (nineteenth) century." [2]

Apart altogether from this "progressive Socialism," to which Mr. Webb here refers, Communism

[1] *Socialism in England*, 3rd edition, p. 18.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

has had its advocates in England for some centuries past; witness, for example, Sir Thomas More, the author of the famed *Utopia* (A.D. 1516). The Pantisocratic schemes of the youthful Southey and Coleridge, about the end of the eighteenth century, afford an early specimen of Communistic speculation, and show that it was then "in the air."[1]

Mr. Thomas Kirkup devotes an interesting chapter to "Early English Socialism" in his *History of Socialism*, in which he traces principally the work and influence of Robert Owen (born 1771, died 1858).

"Compared with the parallel movement in France, the early Socialism of England," writes Mr. Kirkup, "had an uneventful history."[2]

The English Reform Act of 1832 "brought the middle class into power, and by the exclusion of the workmen, emphasised their existence as a separate class,"[3] writes Mr. Kirkup.

Hence the rise of Chartism, which, states Mr. Kirkup, "was most prominently a demand for political reform; but both in its origin and ultimate aim the movement was more essentially economic."[4]

That the sentiment which gave rise to Chartism proceeded to a very considerable extent from economic causes is undeniable. Apart, however, from the purely political programme, Chartism constituted far more a revolt against the doctrine of *laissez faire* than an affirmation of the teachings of Socialism as to-day expounded. So far as Chartism knew how to voice its wants, it was an appeal for State Socialism, *i.e.* social legislation, and *not* a demand for

[1] See *Thomas Poole and his Friends*, by Mrs. Sandford.
[2] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 58.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 70.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

such an entire upheaval of all existing conditions as Revolutionary Socialism would, if successful, entail.

That the circumstances of the time fully justified demands for social reform, few to-day, with any knowledge of the conditions then prevailing, would be prepared to dispute.

After the downfall of Chartism, there is little to be recorded until the '80's.

Mr. Kirkup states: "After the decline of the Owen agitation and of the Christian Socialist movement in 1850, Socialism could hardly be said to exist in England. . . ."[1]; although, as Mr. Kirkup adds, ". . . the English workmen took a considerable share in the founding of the International in 1864 and subsequently. But on the fuller development of the revolutionary tendencies of that movement, and especially after the great disaster of the Commune at Paris, Socialism lost the not very serious hold which it had found among the English working class."[2]

To much the same effect writes Mr. Sidney Webb of Socialism in England. ". . . With the collapse of the Chartist movement in 1848, all serious agitation of a Socialist character came to an end, and for thirty years popular aspirations in England took the forms of a development of trades-unions, the progress of co-operative distributive stores and building societies, in conjunction with the purely political agitation for the Parliamentary franchise."[3]

Mr. W. D. P. Bliss, another Socialist historian, in his *Handbook of Socialism* arrives at a similar

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 327. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 327, 328.
[3] *Socialism in England*, 3rd edition, pp. 18 and 19.

conclusion: "Yet after 1850," writes Mr. Bliss, in recording the progress of Socialism in England, "for thirty long years we seem to come to a gap in the advance of Socialism."[1]

THE PROGRESS OF SOCIALISM IN THE UNITED KINGDOM AFTER 1880

The Origin of the Modern Socialist Movement

The death of Karl Marx in 1883 synchronised with the first serious, organised attempt to win over the English "proletariat" to Socialism.

The determined attempt then initiated to promulgate the doctrines of Socialism throughout England was due very largely to the powerful personal influence which Marx exercised during his lifetime.

Marx, who had long resided in London, had for many years been intimate with the English pioneers of Socialism. Marx, Friedrich Engels, and other foreign Socialists resident in this country, served to maintain an active centre of agitation, in which they were ably assisted by the various prominent foreign Anarchists, who also took refuge in England.

To these influences must be added the publication of Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* in 1881. This book rapidly achieved an enormous success in England, as also was the case in the United States, &c.

"About 1883 English Socialism took a fresh start,

[1] *Handbook of Socialism*, p. 53.

indirectly through the influence of Henry George, and directly through the teaching of Karl Marx," writes Mr. Kirkup ;[1] whilst Mr. Webb is of opinion that ". . . there can be no doubt that it was the enormous circulation of his (George's) *Progress and Poverty* which gave the touch which caused all the seething influences to crystallise into a popular Socialist movement."[2]

The Democratic Federation

In March 1881 was founded the "Democratic Federation," the first definitely Socialist organisation in England. Those principally concerned in its formation were, according to Mr. Webb, Mr. H. M. Hyndman, Mr. Herbert Burrows, and Miss Helen Taylor (step-daughter of John Stuart Mill).[3]

In September 1883 the "Democratic Federation" changed its name to the "Social Democratic Federation," or, as it is popularly termed, the "S.D.F."

Those principally concerned in the new organisation included, in addition to those whose names are already mentioned, Mr. William Morris, poet, artist, Socialist and manufacturer combined ; Mr. J. Stuart Glennie ; Mr. E. Belfort Bax, and Dr. Aveling, son-in-law to Karl Marx.

Before the end of 1883 Mr. Morris, Mr. Belfort Bax, and Dr. Aveling seceded from the Social Democratic Federation and founded "The Socialist League."

[1] *History of Socialism*, p. 328.
[2] See *Socialism in England*, by Mr. Sidney Webb, p. 21.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 22.

Mr. Morris's grounds for secession were, according to Mr. Webb, "mainly personal." Mr. Webb proceeds to add that "the new body developed important differences as to the method of advancing the Socialist cause." Further, that " . . . it has often leanings towards the 'anarchist' section, in resisting the tendency to an over-centralised administration, to which Collectivists are prone."[1]

In reference to the Socialist League Mr. Kirkup observes: "Morris himself, its leading member, had Anarchist leanings, which come out clearly in *News from Nowhere* and other works."[2]

Of the late Mr. William Morris, it is worthy of note that so prominent an exponent of Socialism as Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P., in his recent work *From Serfdom to Socialism* (p. 25), describes him as "the greatest man whom the Socialist movement has yet claimed in this country."

The organ of this organisation was called *The Commonweal.* "The League and its organ," adds Mr. Kirkup, "did not survive many years."[3]

The Socialist League must not be confused with the existing organisation called "The Socialist Party of Great Britain" (the "S.P.G.B."), to which reference is made on p. 84 *infra.*

To revert to the Social Democratic Federation, from which organisation seceded the founders of the Socialist League. In referring to the Social Democratic Federation, Mr. Sidney Webb writes: "In economics it professes to follow Karl Marx, in politics it is 'Collectivist' as well as extremely

[1] *Socialism in England*, p. 33.
[2] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 329.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 329.

democratic, and is marked by a tone of bitter repudiation of both Liberal and Conservative politicians."[1]

The influence of Karl Marx on the Social Democratic Federation is doubtless perpetuated through Mr. H. M. Hyndman, who during the latter years of Marx's life was, it is believed, in constant personal communication with "the founder of Modern Socialism."

The Fabian Society

In the year 1883 also arose the Fabian Society. Many of its members, be it noted, are *also members of other Socialist societies.* It has also, according to Mr. Webb, "a number of active workers chiefly of the middle class, and 'literary proletariat'"; whilst the same prominent member of this organisation informs us, "It furnishes lecturers in considerable number to all meetings where Socialism, in any guise whatsoever, can possibly be introduced. . . ."[2]

The Land Nationalisation Society and The English Land Restoration League

Reference requires to be made to two societies concerned with the subject of Land Nationalisation, viz.: (1) "The Land Nationalisation Society," and (2) "The English Land Restoration League."

The principles advocated by these two societies respectively differ in important respects, both from the Socialist policy in regard to the land, and also

[1] *Socialism in England*, p. 31.
[2] *Ibid.*, 3rd edition, p. 37.

from one another. The consideration of these differences in policy is more suitably treated in discussing the subject of "Socialism and the Land," to which chapter reference should for this purpose be made. (See pp. 443–446.)

Of these two organisations, Mr. Sidney Webb, in the 1901 edition of *Socialism in England*, writes: "The 'Land Nationalisation Society' (London, 11 Southampton Street, Strand) has for its principal exponent the eminent naturalist, Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace, who now declares himself a Socialist." "The 'English Land Restoration League' (London, 8 Duke Street, Adelphi)," writes the same author, "a very vigorous organisation of widespread influence, adheres more closely to the principles of Mr. Henry George."[1]

The Land Nationalisation Society was founded in 1881. At its Third Annual Meeting, held in June 1884, the President, Mr. A. R. Wallace, in his address maintained that Henry George's remedy—the appropriation of the whole ground rent for common purposes—would *not* succeed in redressing the monopoly of land by the few, nor in securing free access for all to the land.

Owing to many of the members of the Land Nationalisation Society disagreeing with views such as the above, prior to this meeting a secession took place early in 1883, and resulted in the formation of "The Land Reform Union." This Society, a few years later, took the name of "The English Land Restoration League."[2]

[1] Page 57, 3rd edition.

[2] See the Appendix to *Socialism of To-day*, by M. Émile de Laveleye, written by Mr. Goddard H. Orpen, pp. 297, 298.

Of this organisation Mr. Sidney Webb expresses the opinion that "Outside the explicitly Socialist societies, the most remarkable development has occurred in the English Land Restoration League, whose 'Red Vans' have perambulated the rural districts with considerable educational results."[1]

Later Events bearing on the History of Socialism

Various subsequent events may be briefly alluded to before proceeding to consider the rise and progress of the Labour Party.

In 1888 came the passing of the Local Government Act, 1888, by the Unionist Government. By this measure popular representative local government was established in every county in England.

Of this Act Mrs. Annie Besant, one of the writers in the *Fabian Essays*, and also one of the most active members of the Social Democratic Federation when first founded, wrote: ". . . In perfect unconsciousness of the nature of his act, Mr. Ritchie[2] has established the Commune. He has divided England into districts ruled by County Councils, and has thus created the machinery without which Socialism was impracticable."[3]

On July 2, 1889, took place the celebrated debate on the "Single Tax versus Social Democracy," between Mr. Henry George and Mr. H. M. Hyndman at the St. James's Hall, London.

[1] *Socialism in England.* Introduction to 2nd edition, p. xiii.

[2] Mr. (afterwards Lord) Ritchie was, in 1888, President of the Local Government Board, and as such was the minister in charge of this measure.

[3] *Fabian Essays*, pp. 152, 153.

Socialism in the United Kingdom

In January 1890 *The Fabian Essays in Socialism* were first published. This work Mr. Sidney Webb describes as "a complete exposition of modern English Socialism in its latest and maturest phase."[1]

The Rise of the Labour Party

The Labour Party—the new name for the Labour Representation Committee—receives far too little attention from the opponents of Socialism.

The Trade Union advance towards political power dates back from 1874. At the Trades Union Congress held in that year it was reported that several societies, including the Miners, had voted money for Parliamentary candidates. Thirteen of these, at the General Parliamentary Election of 1874, went to the poll, and two were returned, namely, Mr. Alex. Macdonald and Mr. Thomas Burt. It must not be imagined, of course, that these candidates were Socialists. Their return was, however, important in that it marked the success of Labour representation. At the next General Election of 1880, Mr. Henry Broadhurst joined the first two Labour members. In the 1885 General Election the number of Labour M.P.'s was increased to eleven. From then, with the ebb and flow of Party successes, the Labour vote rose and fell.

In 1887 took place the Trafalgar Square Riots in London.

The year 1889 was memorable for the London Dock Strike. This strike was principally led by

[1] *Socialism in England*, 3rd edition, p. 38.

Messrs. John Burns, Ben Tillett, and Tom Mann, and finally resulted in success for the strikers.

"The whole 'Labour movement,'" writes Mr. Sidney Webb, "received during 1889 an immense impetus from (1) the successful intervention of the Working Men's Clubs and Trades Unions in the London School Board and County Council Elections; (2) the general success and reasonable moderation of the International Trades Union Congress at Paris; and, above all (3), the remarkable series of strikes mostly led and organised by Mr. John Burns, L.C.C." [1]

In referring to the Trafalgar Square "disturbances," and the London Dock Strike of 1889, Mr. Kirkup observes: "It almost seemed at one period as if English public opinion was veering round to Socialism." [2]

The Independent Labour Party Formed

It was not until after the formation of the Independent Labour Party in 1893 that an organised attempt was made to capture the Labour vote for Socialism pure and simple.

This new organisation was born at Bradford from the convulsions of the Manningham Mill Strike. The father of the Association was none other than the well-known Socialist, Mr. J. Keir Hardie, M.P.

In September 1893 took place the conflict between the military and the Featherstone miners, who were

[1] *Socialism in England*, 3rd edition, p. 48.
[2] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 331.

on strike. This unfortunately was attended by fatal results.

"For the workers of Great Britain the history of the Radical Administration from 1892 to 1895," states a recent Socialist pamphlet, dealing with this subject, "is writ in strife and suffering."[1]

In consequence of the part which Mr. Asquith, as Home Secretary, took in connection with the suppression of the Featherstone Strike, Socialists have not hesitated to brand him "the Featherstone murderer," "Assassin Asquith," &c.

In 1894 the Trades Union Congress, which met at Norwich, "passed by the large majority of 219 to 61, a resolution, which it had rejected by an equally decisive majority at Liverpool in 1890, to the effect, 'That in the opinion of this Congress, it is essential to the maintenance of British industries to nationalise the land, and all the means of production and exchange.'"[2]

This resolution, it will be observed, constitutes a plain declaration in favour of Socialism.

In the General Election of 1895 the Independent Labour Party put forward thirty candidates, who secured 50,000 votes, but none of them were elected.[3]

At this Election "the mass of the English working men," states Mr. Kirkup, "still voted with the old political Parties."[4]

Mr. John Burns was the only candidate who was returned in 1895 primarily as a Labour man, *i.e.* as

[1] *The Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, M.P., and the Featherstone Massacre*, by J. J. Terrett, p. 3 (The Twentieth Century Press).
[2] Mr. Rae's *Contemporary Socialism*, 1901 edition, p. 540.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 540.
[4] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 332.

contra-distinguished from a Liberal-Labour candidate ; whilst even Mr. Burns's majority underwent a substantial reduction, when contrasted with that of 1892.

Formation of the Labour Representation Committee

In 1900 a Labour Representation Committee, on which Trades Unions, the Independent Labour Party, the Social Democratic Federation, and the Fabian Society were all represented, was established. At the end of the first year the Social Democratic Federation retired from being represented on the Committee. The Labour Representation Committee, states Mr. Kirkup, "was too recently formed to take much part in the General Election of 1900." [1]

In the General Parliamentary Election of 1900, usually termed "the Khaki Election," fourteen candidates stood either as Socialists or as nominees of the Independent Labour Party.[2] Only one succeeded, namely, Mr. Keir Hardie, who was returned for Merthyr-Tydfil by a majority of over 1700, after having been previously defeated at the same election for Preston. The fact that the question of the South African War constituted throughout Great Britain the principal issue at this Election, rendered it by no means propitious to that arch-enemy of Nationalism and of Patriotism, Socialism.

In August 1900 occurred the strike on the Taff Vale Railway, which was to prove of such far-reaching importance in its legal consequences.

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 332.
[2] See Mr. Rae's *Contemporary Socialism*, 1901 edition, p. 540.

Beyond all question the decision of the House of Lords in the case of "The Taff Vale Railway Company *v.* The Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants," which was delivered in July 1901, did much to bring success to the newly-formed Labour Representation Committee. The L.R.C. is the offspring of the Trades Union Congress, and the heavy damages which the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants were called upon to pay in the Taff Vale case, which with costs amounted to approximately £23,000, united the Trades Unionists. The decision came to Trades Unionists wholly unexpectedly, and every Union recognised in it a danger which was common to all.

This decision virtually put an end to strikes, which had hitherto undoubtedly acted as a safety-valve to industrial and artisan discontent. The impetus which this decision gave is evidenced by the fact that whereas, in the years 1900–1, the Trades Union members affiliated to the Labour Representation movement amounted to 353,070, in 1903–4 this number had increased to 956,025.

During the years preceding the General Election of 1906, and following the Taff Vale decision in the House of Lords, the Trades Unions became exasperated with the Unionist Government. This Government ultimately left office in the autumn of 1905, without having passed an Act to safeguard Trades Union interests as threatened by this judgment.

The opportunity provided by these events was far too valuable for the Socialists to lose. Their tactics are interesting and characteristic. Previously, in

February 1900, a Conference had been held in the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, London, when the following important resolutions were passed :—

1. "That this Conference is in favour of working-class opinion being represented in the House of Commons by men sympathetic with the aims and demands of the Labour movement, and whose candidatures are promoted by one or other of the organisations represented at this Conference." This was carried by 102 votes to 3.

More significant are the terms of the second resolution, which was actually moved by Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P., himself :—

2. "That this Conference is in favour of establishing a distinct Labour group in Parliament, who shall have their own Whips, and agree upon a policy which must embrace a readiness to co-operate with any Party which for the time being may be engaged in promoting legislation in the direct interest of Labour, and be equally ready to associate themselves with any Party in opposing measures having an opposite tendency ; and, further, members of the Labour group shall not oppose any candidate whose candidature is being promoted in terms of resolution 1." This resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The position immediately before the last General Election of January 1906 was then as follows : There were two sets of Labour candidates. The first group was composed of the candidates put forward by the L.R.C., with the blessing of Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P., and his Socialist colleagues ; whilst the other body consisted of the Labour and Trades Unionist candidates, approved of by the

Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress. There was one converging point upon which all these candidates could meet. They could represent the worker *quâ* worker. The instant that they attempted to represent the worker as a distinctive politician, sharp political divisions at once presented themselves. The difficulty was solved in this way. The Executive of the Labour Party met the Executive of the General Federation of Trades at the Caxton Hall, Westminster, London, and what is known as the Caxton Hall Concordat was agreed to. The following are the terms of this agreement:—

"1. That all candidates running under the auspices of the Labour Representation Committee receive the loyal and hearty support of all sections of the Labour movement.

"2. That Labour and Trades Unionist candidates approved of by the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress receive the support of the Labour Representation Committee, so far as its constitution will permit, on the lines followed during the election for West Monmouthshire, when Mr. Richards was returned.

"3. That in no case do candidates run by either of the organisations referred to oppose, in any shape or form, the candidates run by the other.

"4. In constituencies where no Labour candidates are running, the policy of abstention is in no sense recommended to the local organisations."

The momentous importance of Clause 4 from the Socialist electioneering standpoint will be realised when comparison is made with the constitution of the Labour Representation Committee as it then

was. Before the Concordat was signed, the purely L.R.C. candidates were pledged "to appear before their constituencies under the title of Labour candidates only; abstain strictly from identifying themselves with, or promoting the interests of, any Party not eligible for affiliation; and they must not oppose any candidate recognised by the executive committee of the Party. Candidates must undertake to join the Parliamentary Labour Party, if elected."

The effect of the terms of the Concordat, as read into the constitution, enabled these purely L.R.C. candidates to fraternise with the two recognised political Parties, and to attend purely political clubs, and to seek to win support precisely on the same footing as that upon which the Liberal-Labour candidates work.

In his recent book Mr. Richard Bell, M.P., the well-known Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, refers to this matter as follows: "Indeed, many of the Labour men played up to the Liberals, and in some instances sought an alliance with the Liberals, and even went to Liberal clubs advocating reciprocity. This was done in spite of the pledge given, 'to abstain strictly from identifying themselves with, or promoting the interests of, any section of the Liberal or Conservative Parties.'"[1]

It will generally be conceded that, seeing that in the constituencies there was no distinctive description for that section of Labour candidates whose return was promoted by the L.R.C., as distinguished from those who were the nominees of the Trades Union

[1] *Trade Unionism*, by Richard Bell, M.P., pp. 84 and 85. Published by T. C. & E. C. Jack.

Congress, *many an elector may well have voted for a Socialist unawares.*

The Parliamentary Election of 1906

In referring to the General Parliamentary Election of 1906, and to the work of the Labour Representation Committee in that Election, Mr. Kirkup writes: "At the General Election of 1906, it" (*i.e.* the Labour Representation Committee) "had a great success, and produced an impression even greater on the national mind. As there was no definite dividing-line at the Election between Socialism and Labour, on the one hand, or between Labour and Liberalism on the other, it is impossible to speak precisely as to the results. The purely Socialist vote was reckoned at 106,000. The Independent Labour Party in the House of Commons numbered thirty, of whom nineteen belonged to Socialist organisations. Of the Liberal-Labour group at least five were Socialists. We may reckon the Labour members," concludes Mr. Kirkup, "at fifty-four, *of whom about half were Socialists.*"[1]

At the 1906 General Election the question of the amendment of the Trades Union Law forcibly contributed towards uniting the votes of all Trades Unionists throughout the country.

A Parliamentary candidate, unwilling to pledge himself to support "Shackleton's Bill," had but a slender prospect of securing Trades Union support.

Other causes also directly tended to unite on this occasion the "Labour vote." In this connection,

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 333.

probably none of these additional causes exercised greater or more general influence than did the question of the Transvaal gold mines being worked by "white labour."

The Right Hon. John Burns, M.P., in a recent speech thus summarised the causes which, in his opinion, powerfully contributed towards the striking success of the Labour Party at the 1906 Election:—

"I warn some of the new Labour Party who were floated into Parliament on the river of Free Trade, and I ask where they would have been but for Free Trade, Education, and Chinese labour.

"I will ask them to remember that they were elected by Radical enthusiasm, Liberal votes, and Trades Union funds."[1]

As soon as the Parliamentary Elections of 1906 were concluded, Socialism did its sorting. The purely Trades Union members were left out in the cold—these numbered twenty-three; whilst the Labour Representation Committee men, who totalled twenty-nine, were welcomed as the real Labour M.P.'s.

The Position of Parties in Parliament

The twenty-nine M.P.'s who have signed the constitution of the Labour Representation Committee (now known as the Labour Party) are as follows:—

Barnes, G. N., Glasgow, Blackfriars.
Bowerman, C. W., Deptford.
Clynes, J. R., Manchester, N.E.
Crooks, W., Woolwich.
Duncan, C., Barrow-in-Furness.

[1] Speech at Leeds, December 9, 1907.

Gill, A. H., Bolton.
Glover, T., St. Helens.
Hardie, J. Keir, Merthyr-Tydfil.
Henderson, A., Durham, Barnard Castle.
Hodge, J., Lancashire, Gorton.
Hudson, W., Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Jenkins, J., Chatham.
Jowett, F. W., Bradford, W.
Kelley, G. D., Manchester, S.W.
Macdonald, J. R., Leicester.
Macpherson, J. T., Preston.
O'Grady, J., Leeds, E.
Parker, J., Halifax.
Richards, T. F., Wolverhampton, W.
Roberts, G. H., Norwich.
Seddon, J. A., Lancashire, Newton.
Shackleton, D. J., Lancashire, Clitheroe.
Snowden, Philip, Blackburn.
Summerbell, T., Sunderland.
Thorne, Will, West Ham, S.
Walsh, Stephen, Lancashire, Ince.
Wardle, G. J., Stockport.
Wilkie, Alex., Dundee.
Wilson, W. T., Lancashire, Westhoughton.

To this list there must be added, as the result of by-elections in 1907 :—

Curran, Pete, Jarrow.
Grayson, V., Colne Valley.

The following M.P.'s are Labour representatives in the sense that they have the support of their Trades Unions ; but they are not members of the Parliamentary Socialist Labour Party :—

Bell, Richard, railwayman.
Burns, John, engineer.
Cremer, W. R., carpenter.
Maddison, Fred, compositor.
Nicholls, G., agricultural labourer.
Richardson, A., grocer's assistant.
Rowlands, James, silversmith.
Steadman, W. C., bargebuilder.
Vivian, Henry, carpenter.
Ward, John, navvy.
Wilson, J. Havelock, seaman.

MINERS (14)

Abraham, William.	Johnson, John.
Brace, William.	Johnson, W.
Burt, Thomas.	Richards, T.
Edwards, Enoch.	Taylor, J. W.
Fenwick, Charles.	Wadsworth, W.
Hall, Fred.	Williams, John.
Haslam, J.	Wilson, John.

Many of the men whose names are mentioned in the two latter lists are bitterly opposed to Socialism. They resent, and surely not without just reason, the way in which the constituencies were tricked by the Concordat and the sequel.

As was only to be expected, there was an outcry over the action of the Socialist Labour Party in throwing over the Concordat. In this outcry Mr. Richard Bell, M.P., has been prominent, and his own Society, the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, has been turned against him. The Union has decided that its candidates *must* join the Labour Party, but this Mr. Bell resolutely declines to do.

Mr. Keir Hardie's reply to the attack, which was made when it was realised that the Labour Party was little else than the Independent Labour Party, was in these words:—

"If we are asked to lay down our arms as Socialists, then we can have but one reply—that, with us, Socialism is more than a religion, that it is the life-blood of our veins, and that there can be no minimising, no hiding, no putting aside of our Socialist work and propaganda" (Sept. 6, 1906).

Surely it was a little late in the day to come to the conclusion that there should be "no hiding of Socialist work"—*after* the electors had voted a body of Socialists into Parliament, little dreaming in many cases that they were Socialists at all.

Mr. Bell, M.P., expresses himself as follows on the situation thus created. Mr. Bell has, of course, followed Labour movements closely for a number of years, and his views are consequently of considerable value.

"The policy of the 'Socialist Labour Party,' although they have nearly a million members affiliated, does not meet with the full concurrence of all those members, and a great deal of dissatisfaction exists in many Unions over it. Thousands of Trade Unionists, who have been many years members, and who have been pioneers in the Trade Union movement, helped to build it up numerically and financially, who have been and are loyal to the first and main objects of Trade Unionism, namely, 'to improve the conditions and protect the interests of the members,' object to it being extended outside these objects. They object to their contributions being spent upon those who are outside of the Trade Unions, and for the payment of salaries to Members of Parliament who are not Trade Unionists. While the whole of the members in most Unions approve of some one representing the interests of their Unions in Parliament, they by no means approve of their money going to pay Socialist representatives. The rules of most of the Unions have been altered so as to make the contribution of one shilling per year to the Parliamentary fund compulsory, and therefore most of them pay reluctantly,

whilst some are passive resisters, and eventually will be excluded, and have to forfeit all the benefits for which they have been subscribing many years. It cannot be said, therefore, that the million members affiliated to the 'Socialist Labour Party' are convinced of the utility of amalgamating Trade Unions and Socialist Societies."[1]

In another passage Mr. Bell writes: "If the Independent Labour Party desires to have freedom to propagate its faith and policy at will, and no one else is allowed to express his faith and convictions, then the fair thing would be for the Independent Labour Party to finance their own candidates and members, and not draw so heavily from the Trade Union funds."[2]

The extent to which the Socialist societies *quâ* Socialist societies contribute to the funds which they dominate is ridiculously disproportionate.

Mr. Bell in his recent book states :—

"The 'Labour Party,' as it is now called, is a composite body, the organised Socialist Section only numbering 20,885, as against the Trade Unionist 974,500 at the commencement of January 1907. The Trade Unionists, therefore, subscribe the bulk of the funds; at the same time the constitution allows three seats on the Executive Committee to the Socialists, against nine to the Trade Unionists, the majority of the latter also being pronounced Socialists. The Socialists, however, have more than their share of candidates at the Elections, either by or General Elections, and they have seven members

[1] *Trade Unionism*, by Richard Bell, M.P., pp. 88, 89.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 96.

in Parliament who receive payment of £200 per year, and 25 per cent. of the returning officers' fees. Some of these are not Trade Unionists, being either of the middle class or amateur journalists. The formation of the Labour Party, and of its compulsory maintenance fund, has been a good thing for these Socialist organisations. The bargain from their standpoint is no doubt a good one ; they largely dominate the policy, whilst the Trade Unions provide the funds.

"Until the General Election of 1906 only four of the fourteen Labour Members in Parliament were what were then known as L.R.C. members."[1]

There is an assertion which Socialists frequently make with a view of soothing popular apprehension. They state that there is only one Socialist at the present time a member of the House of Commons, and they refer to Mr. Victor Grayson. This is, of course, the merest "bluff." Practically, the whole of the Labour Party must be counted as being Socialists, whatever they might have pretended to be when they were originally before the constituencies.

They advocate the Collective ownership of the land and means of production, distribution, and exchange, and that is *the great* test. That test should be applied to every Parliamentary candidate in the future, whatever may be the auspices under which he is brought forward. If he subscribes to it, he is a Socialist and nothing short of a Socialist. It is eminently necessary to see that no more Socialists enter Parliament under false representations.

[1] *Trade Unionism*, p. 82.

The Hull Conference, 1908

In January 1908 took place at Hull the Eighth Annual Conference of the Labour Party.

Prior to the opening of the proceedings, interest on the part of the general public centred chiefly in the resolution and amendment to be moved at the Conference on January 21.

The special correspondent of *The Morning Post* thus describes the proceedings on this date :—

"The annual attempt to commit the Labour Party definitely to Socialism was made at the sitting of the Conference to-day" (January 21), "and ended in failure. The decks were cleared for action the first thing this morning, but the fight did not last many hours. The issue was never in doubt. By 951,000 votes to 91,000 the proposal to alter the constitution of the Party was rejected.

"The question came before the Conference in this way. The declared object of the Party is 'to organise and maintain a Parliamentary Labour Party, with its own Whips and policy,' and *the amendment proposed was to define the ultimate object to be* 'the obtaining for the workers the full results of their labour by the overthrow of the present competitive system of capitalism, and the institution of a system of public ownership and control of all the means of life.'

"There were many speakers, and it is a singular fact that with one exception the principal opponents were pronounced Socialists. But of course there was a hidden meaning behind all the talk. *Expediency*

was the controlling influence, and the significance of the result is not to be found in the huge majority so much as in the attitude of those Socialists who foresee the dangers of an open rupture with Trade Unionists at the present juncture. They know full well that they cannot do without the funds and prestige of the great Trade Unions, and that is why the vote was so decisive."[1]

That expediency alone prevented the leaders from seeking to openly pledge the Party to Socialism is sufficiently demonstrated by the significant speech delivered by Mr. J. R. Clynes, M.P., who represented the official view from the platform.

Mr. Clynes began by stating that he believed in the Socialist principles of the resolution. "But many of us are here as politicians," he added warily, "and, so far as we take part in politics, we ought to be careful not to sharpen the weapons of our enemies. I believe that if we force this declaration of our objects on the organised million represented in our Party, the effect will be harmful.

"*Preach Socialism in the country. Do not quarrel about it in the Congress.* When we come somewhere near an equality of numbers with the Trade Unionists, then will be the time for a definite pronouncement."[2] This was the burden of his speech.

Mr. Bruce Glasier, the Independent Labour Party delegate, in an earlier speech took much the same line. "On behalf of the Independent Labour Party," he said, "they did not wish to impose Socialism on those who were not prepared to declare for it, and they rejoiced to work with Trade Unionists."[3]

[1] *The Morning Post*, January 22, 1908.
[2] *The Daily Express*, January 22, 1908.
[3] *The Morning Post*, January 22, 1908.

Mr. Glasier at the same time, be it noted, emphasised that he was the oldest Socialist present at the Conference. Such evidence further tends to clearly show that the attitude adopted by the Socialist leaders who opposed the amendment was governed entirely by tactics and not by principle.

The action of the leaders in opposing the amendment called forth a noteworthy protest from Mr. H. Quelch.

"As far as he could gather," said Mr. Quelch, in concluding his speech, "they of the Labour Party appeared to be sailing with sealed orders, and if the crew knew what they were it was feared that there would be a mutiny, and that they would either leave the ship or scuttle it. *The principles of the Party, as defined by the secretary, were either Social Democracy or so much rhetorical clap-trap.*" [1]

The rejection of the amendment here referred to was clearly foreshadowed by the Socialist organ, *The New Age*, several days before the opening of the Hull Conference.

"The editorial notes of *The New Age* this week," stated *The Daily Express* of January 16, 1908, "deal in a cynically frank way with the true composition and ultimate aims of the Socialist-Labour Party in the House of Commons. 'The year 1907,' says the writer, 'has in some ways been a triumphant year for the Parliamentary Labour Party. . . . The Labour Party has won Trade Unionism from Liberalism.

"'It must be frankly admitted that a certain amount of policy has been necessary. *Everybody knows that the majority of the Labour Party are Socialists;*

[1] *The Morning Post*, January 22, 1908.

everybody knows that if the Socialists were taken out of the Trade Union ranks the movement would resume its ignominious feebleness of thirty or forty years ago.

"'*On the whole, we think the Labour Party has been, and for some time will be, wise in refusing to change its name and profession, even for our name and profession of Socialism.*

"'Sooner or later the time will come when the change must be made, if the Labour Party is to become national in the complete sense, but we agree that the time is not yet.'"

On the same date a resolution favouring the formulating of a National Party programme, which was introduced by Mr. Thorne, was negatived (January 21, 1908).

Mr. Sexton, in opposing the resolution, stated that "the danger of creating a programme was that it would disunite rather than unite the Labour Party."[1]

Equally important, if more unexpected, were the actual proceedings of the Hull Conference at its last sitting, viz., on January 22, 1908.

On this occasion a resolution was moved, the substance of which amounted to the clearest possible affirmation of Socialism.

The exact terms of the resolution, which was proposed by Mr. Stephenson and seconded by Mr. Kelly, were as follows:—

Object of the Party

"That, in the opinion of this Conference, the time has arrived when the Labour Party should have, as

[1] *The Morning Post*, January 22, 1908.

a definite object, the socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, to be controlled by a democratic State in the interests of the entire community, and the complete emancipation of labour from the domination of capitalism and landlordism, with the establishment of social and economic equality between the sexes."

After the speeches of the mover and seconder there was an ominous lull, and it looked as if the Opposition had decided to remain silent. Mr. Shackleton, M.P., who, it should be remembered, is the Deputy-Chairman of the Labour Party and Acting Chairman in the absence of Mr. Keir Hardie, filled the gap thus created, and delivered a weighty declaration against the resolution.

At the conclusion of his speech, Mr. Shackleton said: "You are breaking away from our federal understanding. *You are making it possible for any elector to ask, 'Are you a Socialist?' If you answer 'No,' he can reply, 'You cannot come in the Labour Party.'* I have given you my impression. You take the decision, and you will know the consequences before many years are over."[1]

This concluded the speeches. The closure was duly moved, and on a vote by cards carried by a substantial majority.

Forthwith followed the voting on the resolution, the result of which was as follows:—

For the resolution	514,000
Against the resolution . . .	469,000

The acclamations with which the extreme section of the Socialist forces represented at the Conference

[1] *The Morning Post*, January 23, 1908.

received the result of the voting leaves no doubt as to the importance which Socialists themselves attach to this victory.

Forthwith a considerable section of the Socialists present began singing the Socialist song, "Keep the Red Flag Flying."

For the edification of those unacquainted with this popular Socialist song, we here quote the last verse :—

> "With heads uncovered swear we all
> To bear it onward till we fall.
> Come dungeon dark or gallows grim,
> This song shall be our parting hymn."

The following extract from the account of the special correspondent of *The Morning Post* sufficiently indicates what took place on January 22 :—

"The Socialists have left the Labour Party Conference to-day with feelings of intense satisfaction. They were routed yesterday in their attempt to commit the Party to the adoption of a definitely Socialistic clause in its constitution. To-day they have succeeded in defeating the Trade Union element on a resolution in which Socialist principles are set forth as the object of the Party. . . . The seriousness of the situation was pointed to by Mr. Shackleton, M.P., in a very forcible speech. 'If you pass this resolution,' he said, 'you are breaking away from our federal understanding.' The Socialists, led by Mr. Victor Grayson, M.P., indicated dissent from this view, but there was no denying the rapture with which they greeted the result of the voting."[1]

In view of the speech delivered by Mr. Shackleton

[1] *The Morning Post*, January 23, 1908.

prior to the voting, the delegates cannot by any possibility have been under any misapprehension as to the nature and meaning of the resolution on which they subsequently voted.

It is *not* open, therefore, for those who at future times may wish, for tactical purposes, to pooh-pooh the significance of this vote, to adopt such an attitude.

The adoption of the resolution represents the clearest affirmation of Socialism possible. In this light its significance must be judged.

The Morning Post, in a leading article on January 23, 1908, thus comments for its part on these proceedings:—

"The proceedings of the Labour Conference at Hull are nothing if not surprising. On Tuesday the Conference, by a majority of ten to one, refused to declare that the ultimate object of the Labour Party was 'the overthrow of the present competitive system of capitalism, and the institution of a system of public ownership and control of all the means of life.' By Wednesday the Conference was of opinion, by 560 votes to 411, that the time had arrived when the Labour Party should have as a definite object 'the socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, to be controlled in a democratic State in the interests of the entire community, and the complete emancipation of labour from the domination of capitalism and landlordism, with the establishment of social and economic equality between the sexes.'

"It would appear difficult to find two expressions of opinion more diametrically opposed. Yet the explanation is fairly simple. It is not that the

Labour Party does not know its own mind from one day to another, but that a large proportion of its chosen delegates are irresponsible casuists of a high degree of ingenuity. Tuesday's resolution was in the form of an amendment to the 'constitution' of the Party. If carried, it would have had the effect of excluding from the Party all who would not subscribe to the constitution as amended—all, that is to say, who would not accept the formula of State Socialism. Yesterday's resolution was a mere declaration to be entered on the minutes of the Conference. It does not alter the constitution of the Party. It merely says that the time has come to alter the constitution. Upon this subtle distinction the casuists of the Labour Party rest secure."

In conclusion it should be stated that, according to the annual report of "the Labour Party," the membership at the close of the year 1907 was as follows:—

	Number	Membership
Trades Unions	181	1,049,673
Socialist Societies . . .	2	22,267

Before concluding this summary as to the rise and progress of the Labour Party, one recent Act of Parliament calls for mention.

In 1906, during their first year of office, the new Liberal Government passed the Trades Disputes Bill in a form, *as amended*, satisfactory to the Trades Unionists. This Act over-rides the effect of the Taff Vale decision, and alters the law regarding Trades Unions in other important respects.

Christian Socialism in England

No summary of the history of Socialism in England would be complete without some mention of the Christian Socialists.

The failure of the Chartist agitation in 1848 brought about the celebrated manifesto from Maurice and Kingsley signed "A Working Parson."

Eventually a Society was formed with Maurice as President. Other leaders in this movement were J. M. Ludlow, E. V. Neale, and Judge Thomas Hughes.

The principal attacks of these early Christian Socialists were directed against the Manchester Creed, then in the zenith of its power in England. The education of the working classes formed a conspicuous part of the reforms which they advocated. Socialists of a revolutionary type have, again and again, sought to identify with their cause these zealous social reformers. For this there is *not* one shadow of justification.

Again and again did Maurice and Charles Kingsley declare that they were no Communists, nor did the gospel of expropriating private owners receive any support from them. In the words of a recent excellent pamphlet, entitled *The Church and Socialism* (published by *The Church Family Newspaper*, London 1907): ". . . The social message which Maurice and Kingsley proclaimed to their generation . . . was *worlds away from the economic materialism of Marx*."[1]

Charles Kingsley's *Alton Locke* constitutes a historic

[1] Page 14.

plea on behalf of the down-trodden and sweated workers. It was, most certainly, *not* an advocacy of the doctrines of modern revolutionary Socialism.

These early Christian Socialists gave a powerful stimulus to the whole co-operative movement, as also to the cause of social reform.

The first periodical published by these Christian Socialists was a weekly paper called *Politics for the People.* This in 1850 was followed by a second paper called *The Christian Socialist.*

A later and still existing Christian Socialist organisation in this country is known by the name of "The Guild of St. Matthew." The principles advocated by this society differ wholly from those advanced by Maurice, Kingsley, and their fellow-workers in the movement to which reference has just been made.

This society was founded in 1877 by the Rev. Stewart Headlam, then curate of St. Matthew's, Bethnal Green.

Of "The Guild of St. Matthew" Mr. Sidney Webb writes: ". . . Its founder and head, the Rev. Stewart D. Headlam, is a prominent worker in the Socialist cause. . . ."[1]

Mr. Stewart Headlam in 1907 published *The Socialist Church,* which formed one of the "Labour Ideal Series," of which Messrs. George Allen & Sons were the publishers. He is also the writer of various other works.

Professor Flint in his *Socialism* writes: "Mr. Headlam believes in a Socialism which aims at robbery on a gigantic scale, and in a Religion which

[1] *Socialism in England,* 3rd edition, p. 64.

forbids all dishonesty. What does that prove? That Socialism and Christianity are closely akin? No! Only that Mr. Headlam, like all other men, may regard incompatible things as consistent."[1]

One of Mr. Headlam's strongest supporters is the Rev. the Hon. J. G. Adderley, and one of his ablest followers the Rev. Conrad Noel, author of *The Labour Party: What it is, What it wants.*[2]

Totally different principles to those of the early English Christian Socialists came also to be advocated by a society called "The Christian Socialist Society."

Unlike the earlier society founded by Maurice and Kingsley, this society favoured on an extensive scale State interference. In its organ, *The Christian Socialist*, the doctrines of Karl Marx received support. This organ has declared, records Mr. Rae, "that the command, 'Thou shalt not steal,' if impartially applied, must absolutely prohibit the capitalist, as such, from deriving any revenue whatever from the labourer's toil."[3]

The Christian Social Union was founded in 1889. Its actual originator was the Rev. W. Richmond. The movement was, however, traceable chiefly to the Right Rev. Dr. Westcott, the late Bishop of Durham.

Its existing president is the Right Rev. Dr. Gore, the well-known Bishop of Birmingham. Canon Scott Holland and Mr. C. F. G. Masterman, M.P., are included on its London executive.

The present membership of the C.S.U. is stated

[1] *Socialism*, p. 438.
[2] See *The Church and Socialism*, p. 33. Published by *The Church Family Newspaper*, Fleet Street, E.C.
[3] *Contemporary Socialism*, 1901 edition, p. 88.

at 5000 in the pamphlet published by *The Church Family Newspaper* in 1907.[1]

"The Christian Social Union," states the writer of this most instructive pamphlet, "if we may judge from the utterances of the Bishop of Birmingham and the Rev. R. L. Ottley, has *not* the slightest sympathy with confiscation. It is rather a striking fact that the Union has fought shy of this crucial problem, the cardinal point of divergence between Socialists and non-Socialists. . . . The leaders of the C.S.U. are like the Roman Catholic bishops of America, of whose dilettante Socialism M. Joly says, 'They may not perhaps be much afraid of the word, but they do nothing for the thing itself.'"[2]

All the foregoing Christian Socialist societies were, or are, to a greater or lesser degree, connected with the religion of the Established Church of England.

The Papal Encyclical on Socialism

"As to Catholic doctrine," writes Professor Flint, "that has been set forth in its relation to the labour and social question with an authority which no Catholic will dispute, and an ability and thoughtfulness which all must acknowledge, by the (late) Pontiff, Leo XIII., in a great historical document, the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. There Socialism as a solution of the social question is tested by the standard of Catholic doctrine, and judged accordingly. *The judgment pronounced on it is one which leaves no room for a Catholic becoming*, without the most

[1] *The Church and Socialism*, p. 25. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

manifest inconsistency, *a Socialist* in the proper sense of the term. . . . In his Encyclical the Pope recognises no such distinction as that of a true and a false Socialism, but treats as false all that is truly Socialism." [1]

Scotland and Socialism

"In Scotland," writes Mr. Sidney Webb in 1901, "the Socialist propaganda has had a success corresponding to that in England, and there have been from time to time active 'branches' in all the industrial centres." [2]

In Scotland during the past quarter of a century the history of Socialism has resembled closely that in England. The Scottish Emancipation League, some years back, joined the Social Democratic Federation, and the Scottish Land and Labour League coalesced in the Socialist League.

"The 'Scottish Land and Labour League,'" writes Mr. Sidney Webb in the 1901 edition of *Socialism in England*, "has become a definitely Socialist organisation, and the land nationalisation movement, which is very widespread, is every day taking on more of a Socialist character." [3]

Glasgow has shown distinct leanings towards Socialism, and at its municipal elections Socialism has of late years represented the principal issue in what is by far the largest city in Scotland.

As already stated, Socialism has followed much

[1] *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, p. 439. And see the speech of his Eminence Cardinal Logue, p. 49 *infra*.
[2] *Socialism in England*, p. 60, 3rd edition.
[3] Page 61, 3rd edition.

the same course in Scotland as in England, and therefore does not require separate treatment. So far, however, as the future is concerned, assuming that the success of Socialism in Great Britain increases, there is good reason for believing that, after a certain stage has been reached, the progress of Socialism north of the Tweed will be considerably slower than in the south. The proverbial thrift of the people, and the much more intelligent and serious study which the Scotch devote to politics, as compared with the English, will in all probability render, after Socialism has attained a certain initial degree of success, the subsequent progress of Socialism in Scotland much slower than in England. The reaction in Scotland may be expected to come more speedily. Doubtless such meretricious proposals as those contained in Mr. Philip Snowden's *Socialist Budget* will receive a large amount of temporary support. Gradually, however, as "the shoe begins to pinch," the fallacies of Socialism will come home to a nation which has ever been conspicuous for the number of instances which it has afforded of men rising by sheer force of perseverance and ability "from the bottom rung of the ladder to the top."

To such a nation, ultimately, the dead-level existence which Socialism proposes to establish and to maintain, should prove singularly destitute of charms. The Scotch surely will be the last nation to admit that "all men are equal," as Socialism propounds, when they grasp the full consequences which flow from that doctrine.

Ireland and Socialism

"Ireland," frankly admits Mr. Sidney Webb, "has *not* proved a successful field for avowed and conscious Socialist propaganda. . . ."[1]

In Ireland the proportion of the population resident in large urban centres is extremely small. Accordingly, the agrarian question is for the Irish *the* great question. In Ireland this question serves to dominate all other political issues to an extent which exists in no other part of the United Kingdom. The root ambition of the Irish peasant is to acquire the absolute ownership of the soil. The workings of the Congested Districts Board in the West of Ireland to-day go unmistakably to show that the peasant views with considerable hostility the importation of others, even though from a part of the same county, to share in the adjoining land which he has long regarded as his by right.

The Irish peasant, with his strongly developed longing for the absolute ownership of land, is unlikely to forego what he is now within measurable reach of obtaining in exchange for the promise of $\frac{1}{44,000,000}$ *indivisible* part of the land of the United Kingdom, as the doctrines of Socialism demand.

So far as concerns the Irish peasant, the enemy most to be feared at the present time is *not* the Socialist demagogue, but the usurer. Should the former come to be inextricably caught in the toils of the gombeen-man, then, indeed, Socialism may be expected to make rapid progress in Ireland.

[1] *Socialism in England*, 3rd edition, p. 61.

Socialism in the United Kingdom

The death of Mr. Michael Davitt on May 31, 1906, long one of the most prominent members of the Irish Nationalist Party, represented no small loss to Socialism in Ireland and in Great Britain.

Mr. Davitt, down to the present time, has been the only prominent Irish politician to openly proclaim himself in accord with the doctrines of the Socialist organisations in this country.

That the Irish Nationalist Party may in the near future, for purely tactical purposes, enter into an offensive and defensive alliance with the British Socialist Party in Parliament is more than probable. Since the approach of the General Parliamentary Election of 1906 these two parties have been accustomed to frequently assist each other at British Parliamentary elections, and, since that date, also to co-operate inside the House of Commons.

In this connection an important speech was delivered by his Eminence Cardinal Logue, Archbishop of Armagh and Catholic Primate of all Ireland, on September 29, 1907.

"I think it," stated Cardinal Logue, speaking in Londonderry, "a very ominous thing when we find the politicians of the country entering into an alliance with Socialism and Secularism under the pretence of securing Home Rule for Ireland. *Socialism* as it is preached on the Continent, and as it has commenced and begun to be preached in these countries, *is simply irreligion and atheism. Its policy is to banish God* from the schools and from the hearts of the people." [1]

From the foregoing it is evident that the Catholic

[1] Quoted from *The Freeman's Journal*, September 30, 1907.

hierarchy and priesthood in Ireland are fully awake to the grave dangers accompanying the growth of Socialism and to its anti-religious nature. They may be expected, therefore, to use their powerful influence in combating the development of Socialism in Ireland.

Ireland has already to-day a separate Socialist organisation called "The Socialist Party of Ireland."

The programme of this organisation states (*inter alia*) "That the remedy for the existing state of society is to be found in the establishment of a Socialist republic, in which the worker shall be guaranteed the full product of his toil, and the advantage of every improvement in the mode of life."

As to how this guarantee is to be rendered effective is very wisely and discreetly not disclosed by the organisation.

Meantime, it is announced that in January 1908 eleven Labour-Socialist candidates were defeated by large majorities at the Belfast municipal elections. The rejected nominees included two of the best known Labour leaders in Ulster, former members of the Corporation.[1]

The Existing Socialist Organisations of Great Britain: their Programmes and Methods

Having thus briefly traced the origin of the various Socialist organisations, it now becomes necessary to refer to the programmes advanced by the existing

[1] *The Morning Post*, January 17, 1908.

Socialist organisations in this country at the present time.

In the first place it is necessary to emphasise that Socialists divide themselves into evolutionary and revolutionary Socialists. The principal corresponding organisations are as follows:—

Evolutionary Socialists

1. The Fabian Society.
2. The Independent Labour Party (the "I.L.P.").
3. The "Labour Party."
4. The *Clarion* Organisations, such as the *Clarion* Scouts, &c.

Revolutionary Socialists

1. The Social Democratic Federation (the "S.D.F.").
2. The Socialist Party of Great Britain (the "S.P.G.B.").

It is necessary to ask your disputant, if arguing against Socialism, to which of these Societies he belongs, for the reason that it is impossible to reply to I.L.P. Socialism with an exposure of the S.D.F. variety, and *vice versâ*.

Fortunately there is a fundamental basis which is common to all these various forms of Socialism, and it may be expressed shortly as being "the collective ownership by the State of the land and all the means of production, distribution, and exchange, and the co-operative working of the same by the people and for the people."

Evolutionary Socialist Organisations

I.—*The Fabian Society*

The Fabian Society has, since its foundation in 1883, played and is playing a unique part in the social and political movements of this country. Mr. Bliss, one of the prominent Socialist historians of the present day, writes of this organisation as follows: "Commenced mainly as an educational and propagandist centre, it includes members of other societies, and has met with unparalleled success. Its members, going into every club where they could get a hearing, have really changed the tone of London. Ten years ago the characteristic note of the London working men's clubs was one of negative Radicalism. To-day it is one of positive Collectivism. Many Trades Unionists belong to it, including such names as Tom Mann and Ben Tillett. Equally influential has the Society been in politics. By manifestoes, tracts, and articles in papers and magazines (this political portion of the work largely done by Sidney Webb), a Socialist programme has been placed before the political public, and the two great Parties have been led to seek votes by adopting portion after portion of this programme. An important course of seven lectures by members of the Society (George Bernard Shaw, Sidney Webb, LL.B., William Clarke, M.A., S. Olivier, B.A., Graham Wallas, M.A., Annie Besant, and Hubert Bland), entitled *Fabian Essays in Socialism*, was published in 1889, and has reached an enormous sale. . . . There are over fifty local Fabian societies formed in most of the

important English cities, and it is altogether one of the most active and successful organisations of its kind in existence."[1]

The Fabian Society is one of the most dangerous organisations with which anti-Socialists in Great Britain to-day have to cope. To a large extent it works subterraneously, and it has perfected a scheme of "permeation" by means of which it exerts a powerful influence in the least likely quarters.

The following admissions, which are taken from *Fabian Tract*, No. 41—the work of Mr. Bernard Shaw—abundantly prove the truth of this statement: "We urged our members to join the Liberal and Radical Associations of their districts, or, if they preferred it, the Conservative Associations. We told them to become members of the nearest Radical Club and Co-operative Store, and to get delegated to the Metropolitan Radical Federation and the Liberal and Radical Union if possible. On these bodies we made speeches and moved resolutions, or, better still, got the Parliamentary candidate for the constituency to move them, and secured reports and encouraging little articles for him in the *Star*. We permeated the Party organisations and pulled all the wires we could lay our hands on with our utmost adroitness and energy; and we succeeded so far that in 1888 we gained the solid advantage of a Progressive majority, full of ideas that would never have come into their heads had not the Fabian put them there, on the first London County Council. The generalship of this movement was undertaken chiefly by Sidney Webb, who played such bewildering

[1] *Handbook of Socialism*, by W. D. P. Bliss, p. 58.

conjuring tricks with the Liberal thimbles and the Fabian peas, that to this day both the Liberals and the sectarian Socialists stand aghast at him. It was exciting whilst it lasted, all this 'permeation of the Liberal Party,' as it was called; and no person with the smallest political intelligence is likely to deny that it made a foothold for us in the Press and pushed forward Socialism in municipal politics to an extent which can only be appreciated by those who remember how things stood before our campaign. When we published *Fabian Essays* at the end of 1889, having ventured with great misgiving on a subscription edition of a thousand, it went off like smoke; and our cheap edition brought up the circulation to about twenty thousand. In the meantime we had been cramming the public with information in tracts, on the model of our earliest financial success in that department, namely, *Facts for Socialists*, the first edition of which actually brought us a profit—the only instance of the kind then known. In short, the years 1888, 1889, 1890 saw a Fabian boom, the reverberation of which in the provinces at last produced the local Fabian societies which are represented here to-night. And I now come to the most important part of this paper: for I must at once tell you that we are here, not to congratulate ourselves on the continuance of that boom, but to face the fact that it is over, and that the time has come for a new departure."[1]

Equally frank is the statement of the ultimate aim of these intriguers. "Whilst our backers at the polls are counted by tens, we must continue to crawl and

[1] *Fabian Tract*, No. 41, pp. 18, 19.

drudge and lecture as best we can. When they are counted by hundreds we can permeate and trim and compromise. When they rise to tens of thousands we shall take the field as an independent Party. Give us hundreds of thousands, as you can if you try hard enough, and we will ride the whirlwind and direct the storm." [1]

As might only have been expected, the Fabian Society has craftily exploited the Press. "As to a paper, we recognise that a workman expects for his penny a week a newspaper as big and as full of general news as any of the regular Sunday papers. Therefore our policy has been to try to induce some of these regular papers to give a column or two to Socialism, calling it by what name they please. And I have no hesitation in saying that the effect of this policy, as shown in the *Manchester Sunday Chronicle*, the *Star*, the London *Daily Chronicle*, and other more exclusively working-class papers, notably the *Clarion*, has done more for the cause than all the time and money that has been wasted on *Justice* since the *Star* was founded. *Fabian News* does everything for us that *Justice* does for the Federation ; but what would you think of us if we invited you to offer it for a penny to the man in the street as the leading organ of Social Democracy in England ? Our mission is to Socialise the Press as we hope to Socialise Parliament and the other Estates of the realm, not to run the Press ourselves." [2]

Mr. Bernard Shaw even gloats over his victims : "We collared the *Star* by a stage-army stratagem, and before the year was out had the assistant editor,

[1] *Fabian Tract*, No. 41, p. 28. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

Mr. H. W. Massingham, writing as extreme articles as Hyndman had ever written in *Justice*. Before the capitalist proprietors woke up to our game and cleared us out, the competition of the *Star*, which was immensely popular under what I may call the Fabian *régime*, had encouraged a morning daily, the *Chronicle*, to take up the running ; and the *Star*, when it tried to go back, found that it could not do so further than to Gladstonise its Party politics. On other questions it remained and remains far more advanced than the wildest Socialist three years before ever hoped to see a capitalist paper. Nowadays even the *Daily News* has its Labour column, although five years ago the editor would as soon have thought of setting aside a column for Free-thinkers." [1]

Here, again, is an astounding confession of successful trickery : " In 1888 it only cost us twenty-eight postcards written by twenty-eight members to convince the newly-born *Star* newspaper that London was aflame with Fabian Socialism." [2]

There is grave reason to believe that the constitutional Press of to-day shelters many of the secret workers of the Fabian Society. A paragraph may be slipped in here, or, better still, an anti-Socialist writer sternly repulsed without the knowledge of an overworked editor. These matters must be taken in hand, and that speedily, if the case against Socialism is to be fairly presented to the people of this country.

The arrangement under which subscriptions are received by the Society without involving membership is typically Fabian. There are many who

[1] *Fabian Tract*, No. 41, p. 18. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

hesitate. They have read something somewhere which has suggested a train of thought. Such men apply to the Fabian Society for literature. The case for Socialism, most ingeniously presented, is put before them. Unfortunately, the evidence on the other side is not similarly, at present, forthcoming. Thus many of these persons pass on, in time, into full, and, as likely as not, active membership.

From a notice circulated by the Fabian Society, signed by the Secretary of the Society, and addressed from "3 Clement's Inn, Strand, London, W.C.," the following quotation is taken :—

"The Fabian Society is supported by the voluntary subscriptions of its members and friends, and the extent of its operations is limited by the amount of the funds at its disposal.

"The chief object to which the Society devotes its resources is the education of the people in political, economic, and social subjects. To effect this purpose it must in the first place educate itself by the discussion of those problems which from time to time appear ripe for solution. Its members therefore undertake the study of such problems and lay the results before the Society, where they are considered from various points of view. Finally, the conclusions adopted or generally approved by the members are published, usually in penny tracts, and by this means made available for the information of all.

"The Society further endeavours to promote social amelioration, by the dissemination of information about existing institutions, in order that better use

may be made of the powers already possessed by local administrative authorities, now too often neglectful of their obligations.

"The same ends are sought to be attained by means of circulating libraries supplied to Workmen's Clubs, Co-operative Societies, Trades Unions and similar bodies, and by the publication of lists of best books on social and political subjects.

"The Society also at times engages trained lecturers to give courses of lectures during the winter months on social politics to working-class and other organisations.

"The members of the Society, who control its policy, are Socialists—that is to say, are committed to the theory of the probable direction of economic evolution which is now often called Collectivism. But much of the activity of the Society must meet with the approval of all those interested in Social Reform, many of whom are not concerned to adopt a definite social ideal, and could not therefore apply for membership in the Society. To all such we venture to appeal for help for the Society's educational work.

"Any who are willing to assist are invited to subscribe to the funds without becoming members. Such subscriptions may be allocated to any branch of the Society's work which may be selected. Subscribers of sums not less than 5s. a year can attend the ordinary meetings of the Society, except those called for private business, and will receive *Fabian News*, its monthly journal, together with all the publications issued to members."

The following further information is taken from

other publications issued at the date of writing by the Fabian Society:—

THE FABIAN SOCIETY

Application for Membership

Basis

The Fabian Society consists of Socialists.

It therefore aims at the reorganisation of Society by the emancipation of Land and Industrial Capital from individual and class ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit. In this way only can the natural and acquired advantages of the country be equitably shared by the whole people.

The Society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in Land and of the consequent individual appropriation, in the form of Rent, of the price paid for permission to use the earth, as well as for the advantages of superior soils and sites.

The Society, further, works for the transfer to the community of the administration of such industrial Capital as can conveniently be managed socially. For, owing to the monopoly of the means of production in the past, industrial inventions and the transformation of surplus income into Capital have mainly enriched the proprietary class, the worker being now dependent on that class for leave to earn a living.

If these measures be carried out, without compensation (though not without such relief to expropriated individuals as may seem fit to the community) Rent and Interest will be added to the reward of labour, the idle class now living on the labour of others will necessarily disappear, and practical equality of opportunity will be maintained by the spontaneous action of economic forces with much less interference with personal liberty than the present system entails.

For the attainment of these ends the Fabian Society looks to the spread of Socialist opinions, and the social and political changes consequent thereon, including the establishment of equal citizenship for men and women. It seeks to achieve

these ends by the general dissemination of knowledge as to the relation between the individual and Society in its economic, ethical, and political aspects.

Subscription

A fixed subscription, equal for each member, is not desirable in the Fabian Society, as it would press unequally on members with widely different incomes, and would have to be unreasonably high. Members are therefore left free to subscribe according to their means, and it is suggested that a voluntary income tax of ½ per cent. (10s. for each £100 of the member's income) will meet the case of fairly well-to-do people.

Who's Who in the Fabian Society

The principal Socialist Fabian writers are Messrs. Sidney Webb, Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, and E. R. Pease. The Fabian Society has a magazine of its own entitled *The Fabian News*, but also smuggles articles and letters into newspapers controlled by its opponents. It "has no preference, except for the largest circulation."[1]

DIFFERING METHODS OF RIVAL SOCIALIST BODIES

THE FABIAN METHOD

"All that is socially needed shall be socially owned." All Socialists agree as to that. They differ, however, on the method of acquisition. Thus the Fabian Society "sympathises with the ordinary citizen's desire for gradual peaceful changes, as against revolution, conflict with the army and police, and martyrdom. . . . It therefore does not believe that the moment

[1] See *Fabian Tract*, No. 70, p. 6.

will ever come when the whole of Socialism will be staked on the issue of a single General Election, or a single Bill in the House of Commons, as between the proletariat on one side and the proprietariat on the other." [1]

"The Fabian Society does not suggest that the State should monopolise industry as against private enterprise or individual initiative, further than may be necessary to make the livelihood of the people and their access to the sources of production completely independent of both. The freedom of individuals . . . to complete the social organisation by adding the resources of private activity and judgment to those of public routine, is, subject to the above conditions, as highly valued by the Fabian Society as Freedom of Speech," &c.[2]

This, of course, is all very reassuring! But is it likely that "private activity and judgment" would be found willing "to complete the social organisation"? If the Fabians snapped up what was valuable, would a threatened and looted individualism be ready to toil to create something new of value for the Fabians to seize possession of?

The answer surely is to be found by the application of two tests. The first is, Do the Fabians propose to pay for what they take? And the other is, Would wealth under their system have earning power in private hands?

On page 19 of *Fabian Tract*, No. 7, these questions are answered in the negative. "If these measures" (*i.e.* the socialisation of the land and industrial capital) "be carried out without compensation (though

[1] See *Fabian Tract*, No. 70, p. 4. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

not without such relief to expropriated individuals as may seem fit to the community) Rent and Interest will be added to the reward of labour. . . ."

The "relief," therefore, is to be something merely nominal, and of such a character that it must *not* be even dignified with the description of "compensation."

Further, if the State owns collectively all that is socially needed, and the object of the State policy be to abolish rent and interest, capital would, in this country at least, have no investing value; and, if Socialism became international, it will be of no use to send what is given as "relief" abroad for investment.

An important practical point on Fabian policy is this: How can a compulsory State-assumption of private property (without adequate compensation) prove to be anything but revolutionary Socialism?

Property-owners and the millions of thrifty citizens will not suffer themselves to be ousted without a fight. It is all very well to talk of "evolutionary" Socialism and peaceful methods, and in that way to secure the support of waverers and weaklings. The only guarantee of peaceful methods is compensation—and full compensation—and *no* Socialist society proposes to grant anything of the sort.

II.—THE I.L.P.

The Independent Labour Party, commonly known as the "I.L.P.," was founded, as already mentioned, in 1893. It is avowedly Socialistic, as is evident from its programme. It has countless branches

throughout the country, and each of these branches possesses organisers and speakers. Some thousands of meetings are held monthly, and a vast amount of attractive literature is on sale. The chairman of this body is Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, M.P., and it is something much more than a coincidence that the same gentleman, who is an advanced Socialist, is the secretary of the Labour Party, an organisation which was known at the last General Parliamentary Election of 1906 as "The Labour Representation Committee."

The following announcement is printed at the foot of many of the I.L.P. leaflets :—

"The Independent Labour Party is a political organisation for the propagation of Socialism. It seeks the political and industrial organisation of the workers, and the independent representation of Socialist principles on all elective bodies. The I.L.P. has since 1893 carried on a great propaganda work throughout the country. It has spent £250,000 on this work. The I.L.P. is the political Party for the earnest social reformer. If you are such, kindly use this form of application for membership and send it to the local secretary."

The widespread power of the I.L.P. will be admitted when it is stated that on November 30, 1907, there were no fewer than 709 branches. New branches are being opened at the rate of five per week. The strain on the publication department has necessitated its recent enlargement, and many thousands of meetings are annually held.

The *Labour Leader*, the weekly organ of the Independent Labour Party, in a leading article, on

August 16, 1907, entitled "Unsurpassed Propaganda," writes as follows: "From the standpoint of the I.L.P. propagandist, it" (the present summer) "has been the most successful in the history of the movement. . . . Nothing like this season's I.L.P. propaganda has ever been attempted by any political organisation in the country. It is estimated that our branches have been holding at least 2000 meetings a week. . . . Thirteen new branches of the Independent Labour Party were formed last week."

One may well re-echo the words of the *Labour Leader*, and ask what other political organisation in this country can point to even a tithe of this work?

The Independent Labour Party is a peculiarly dangerous organisation. It is to a very large extent a Party of clever opportunists and trimmers. The outspoken Socialism of the Social Democratic Federation variety is so extreme as to repel at the outset many who might readily endorse a less militant and fiery propagandism. That is where the I.L.P. wins adherents. Signs are not wanting that under opposition the I.L.P. will still further "water down" their immediate aims, and the nearer their proposals approximate to the practical facts of life the more dangerous this Society will in fact become.

It would be well, therefore, to carefully bear in mind the one aim which is shared in common by *all* Socialists. Are we in favour of the collective ownership by the State of everything, except the most trivial and valueless personal possessions in the shape of the commoner kinds of clothing, &c.? That is

what Socialism means, and that is what the Socialism of the I.L.P., however craftily it may be veiled, intends.

The I.L.P. Method

The Independent Labour Party's methods are sufficiently indicated in *The Socialist's Budget* by Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., and published in the Labour Ideal Series during 1907.

Mr. Snowden's first Budget provides for a modest increase in taxation of £72,100,000, all to be derived from an increased income tax, estate duties, and the taxation of land values.[1] The concluding paragraph of Mr. Snowden's book seems admirably to sum up the general policy of the Independent Labour Party. "The Socialist object, as stated in the first chapter, is to secure all socially-created wealth for Society. Such a Budget as we have outlined would be a new beginning towards that end. The end would be achieved when, by the social ownership of the instruments of wealth-production, Society owned and controlled the wealth produced. That is the Socialist goal. Meanwhile, taxation may be used to palliate some of the evils which, in degree, must always exist so long as land and capital are the monopoly of individuals."[2]

Who's Who in the I.L.P.

This organisation has an army of able writers. Messrs. Keir Hardie, J. R. Macdonald, Philip Snowden,

[1] *The Socialist's Budget*, by Philip Snowden, M.P., p. 87.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 88.

F. W. Jowett, all of whom at present are M.P.'s, are the better known. The weekly journal is the *Labour Leader*, and this paper has a large and rising circulation.

The constitution and rules of the Independent Labour Party are as follows :—

Independent Labour Party—Constitution and Rules, 1907–8

Name

The Independent Labour Party.

Object

An Industrial Commonwealth founded upon the Socialisation of Land and Capital.

Methods

The education of the community in the principles of Socialism.

The Industrial and Political Organisation of the Workers.

The Independent Representation of Socialist principles on all elective bodies.

Programme

The true object of industry being the production of the requirements of life, the responsibility should rest with the community collectively, therefore :

The land, being the storehouse of all the necessaries of life, should be declared and treated as public property.

The capital necessary for industrial operations should be owned and used collectively.

Work, and wealth resulting therefrom, should be equitably distributed over the population.

As a means to this end, we demand the enactment of the following measures :—

1. A maximum forty-eight hours' working week, with the retention of all existing holidays, and Labour Day, May 1, secured by law.

2. The provision of work to all capable adult applicants at recognised trade-union rates, with a statutory minimum of sixpence per hour.

In order to remuneratively employ the applicants, Parish, District, Borough, and County Councils to be invested with powers to :

(*a*) Organise and undertake such industries as they may consider desirable.

(*b*) Compulsorily acquire land ; purchase, erect, or manufacture buildings, stock, or other articles for carrying on such industries.

(*c*) Levy rates on the rental values of the district, and borrow money on the security of such rates for any of the above purposes.

3. State pensions for every person over fifty years of age, and adequate provision for all widows, orphans, sick, and disabled workers.

4. Free secular, moral, primary, secondary, and university education, with free maintenance while at school or university.

5. The raising of the age of child labour, with a view to its ultimate extinction.

6. Municipalisation and public control of the Drink Traffic.

7. Municipalisation and public control of all Hospitals and Infirmaries.

8. Abolition of indirect taxation and the gradual transference of all public burdens on to unearned incomes with a view to their ultimate extinction.

The Independent Labour Party is in favour of adult suffrage, with full political rights and privileges for women, and the immediate extension of the franchise to women on the same terms as granted to men ; also triennial Parliaments and second ballot.

Organisation

I.—*Membership*

1. Open to all Socialists who endorse the objects and methods of the Party, and are accepted by the particular branch they desire to join.

2. Any person expelled from membership of a branch of the I.L.P. shall not be eligible for membership of any other branch without having first submitted his or her case for adjudication of N.A.C.

II.—*Officers*

1. Chairman and Treasurer.

2. No member shall occupy the office of Chairman of the Party for a longer period than three years, and he shall not be eligible for re-election for the same office for at least twelve months after he has vacated the chair.

3. *A National Administrative Council.*—To be composed of eleven representatives, in addition to the two officers.

4. *Election of N.A.C.*—Four members of the N.A.C. shall be elected by ballot at the Annual Conference, and seven by the votes of members in seven divisional areas.

5. *Duties of N.A.C.* :—

(*a*) To meet at least three times a year to transact business relative to the Party.

(*b*) To exercise a determining voice in the selection of Parliamentary candidates, and, where no branch exists, to choose such candidates when necessary.

(*c*) To raise and disburse funds for General and By-elections, and for other objects of the Party.

(*d*) To deal with such matters of local dispute between branches and members which may be referred to its decision by the parties interested.

(*e*) To appoint and exercise a supervising control over the work of the secretary and officials.

(*f*) To engage organisers and lecturers when convenient, either permanently or for varying periods, at proper wages, and to direct and superintend their work.

(*g*) To present to the Annual Conference a report on the previous year's work and progress of the Party.

(*h*) The N.A.C. may appoint Sub-Committees to deal with special branches of its work, and shall appoint a Committee to prepare the Conference Agenda.

(*i*) It shall not initiate any new departure or policy between Conferences without first obtaining the sanction of the majority of the branches.

(*k*) Matters arising between Conferences not provided for by the Constitution, shall be dealt with by the N.A.C.

6. *Auditor.*—A Chartered Accountant shall be employed to audit the accounts of the Party.

III.—*Branches*

1. *Branch.*—An Association which endorses the objects and methods of the Party, and affiliates in the prescribed manner.

2. *Local Autonomy.*—Subject to the general constitution of the Party, each branch shall be perfectly autonomous.

3. Branches of the Party may form Municipal, Ward, District, or Parish Council groups within their respective areas.

IV.—*Finances*

1. Branches shall pay one penny per member per month to the N.A.C.

2. The N.A.C. may receive donations or subscriptions to the funds of the Party. It shall not receive moneys which are contributed upon terms which interfere in any way with its freedom of action as to their disbursement.

3. The financial year of the Party shall begin on March 1, and end on the last day of February next succeeding.

V.—*Annual Conference*

1. Is the ultimate authority of the Party, to which all final appeal shall be made.

2. *Date.*—Shall be held at Easter.

3. *Special Conferences.*—A Special Conference shall always be called prior to a General Election, for the purpose of determining the policy of the Party during the election. Other Special Conferences may be called by two-thirds of the whole of the members of the N.A.C., or by one-third of the branches of the Party.

4. *Conference Fee.*—A conference fee of 10s. per delegate shall be paid by all branches desiring representation on or before the last day of February in each year. The N.A.C. shall have power to reduce the amount of the Conference Fee.

5. No branch shall be represented which was not in existence on the December 31 immediately preceding the date of the Conference.

6. Branches of the Party may send one delegate to Conference for each fifty members, or part thereof. Branches may appoint one delegate to represent their full voting strength. Should there be two or more branches which are unable separately to send delegates to Conference, they may jointly do so.

7. Delegates must be members of the branch they represent.

8. Notices respecting resolutions shall be posted to branches not later than January 3. Resolutions for the Agenda, and nominations for officers and N.A.C. shall be in the hands of the General Secretary eight weeks before the date of the Annual Conference, and issued to the branches a fortnight later. Amendments to the resolutions on the Agenda and additional nominations may be sent to the Secretary four weeks before Conference, and they shall be arranged on the final Agenda, which shall be issued to branches two weeks before Conference.

9. The Chairman of the Party for the preceding year shall preside over the Conference.

10. *Conference Officials.*—The first business of the Conference shall be the appointment of tellers. It shall next elect a Standing Orders Committee, with power to examine the credentials of delegates, to revise the Conference Agenda, and to deal with special business which may be delegated to it by the Conference.

11. In case any vacancy occurs on the N.A.C. between Conferences, the unsuccessful candidate receiving the largest number of votes at the preceding Conference shall fill the vacancy. Vacancies in the list of officers shall be filled up by the vote of the branches.

12. The principle of the second ballot shall be observed in all elections.

13. The Conference shall choose the place of the next Conference.

VI.—*Parliamentary Candidates*

1. The N.A.C. shall keep a list of members of the Party from which candidates may be selected by branches.

2. Any branch at any time may nominate any eligible member of the Party to be placed upon that list.

3. The N.A.C. itself may place names on the list.

4. No person shall be placed on this list unless he has been a member of the Party for at least twelve months.

5. Branches desiring to place a candidate in their constituencies must in the first instance communicate with the N.A.C., and have the candidate selected at a properly convened conference of representatives of the local branches of all societies affiliated with the Labour Party, so that the candidate may be chosen in accordance with the constitution of the Labour Party. The N.A.C. shall have power to suspend this Clause where local or other circumstances appear to justify such a course.

6. Before the N.A.C. sanctions any candidature it shall be entitled to secure guarantees of adequate local financial support.

7. No branch shall take any action which prejudicially affects the position or prospects of a Parliamentary candidate without first laying the case before the N.A.C.

8. Each candidate must undertake, in such manner as the N.A.C. determines, that he will run his election in accordance with the principles and policy of the Party, and that if elected he will support the Party on all questions coming within the scope of the principles of the I.L.P.

III.—THE LABOUR PARTY

To this body detailed reference has already been made in tracing the history of the rise of the Labour Party in England (see pp. 19–41).

IV.—THE *CLARION* ORGANISATIONS

There are two other organisations—the *Clarion* Fellowship and the *Clarion* Scouts. These seem to have been formed with the object of bringing together the readers of the weekly paper of that name. Beyond doubt they successfully disseminate a vast mass of Socialist and semi-Socialist fallacies amongst the ill-informed. The publicist of this movement is Mr. Robert Blatchford, who makes frequent contributions towards fomenting class war. That the shallow fallacies in such publications as *Merrie England* and *Britain for the British* should deceive any one would be unbelievable in the absence of conclusive evidence to the contrary. As things are, however, people with whom sentiment is more marked than sense, accept these outpourings as gospel.

THE *CLARION* AND BLATCHFORD METHOD

The *Clarion* Fellowship proposals are expounded by Mr. Blatchford. On page 89 of *Britain for the British* this writer sets out his scheme of Socialism. One of the items is: "The land and railways, collieries, &c., to be bought from the present owners, but not at fancy prices." Then again on pages 76 and 77: "First we do not propose to *seize* anything. We do propose to get some things —the land, for instance—and to make them the property of the whole nation; but we mean that to be done by Act of Parliament and by purchase."

On page 61 of this same work we are presented

with Mr. Blatchford's idea of what is a fair price: "Pay the present owners of land the full rent for fourteen or, say, twenty years, or, in a case where land has been bought in good faith, within the past fifty years, allow the owner the full rent for thirty years."

What does this really mean? In view of the enormous investments in or upon the security of land to-day held by Building Societies, Insurance Societies, and Friendly Societies, the point is of popular importance. We will take the longer period of thirty years. The rent paid during that period will probably secure the return of the capital outlay. It will certainly not allow of any margin for interest as well, so from the day of the passing of such an Act all working-class investment societies will practically collapse. Then, at the end of the term, all that will have happened will be that Socialism will not have abolished private capital; for real property, so far as private individual interests are concerned, will merely have been transformed into personalty.

That is not, however, what Mr. Blatchford is aiming at, and on page 77 of *Britain for the British* we have the true note: "*Destroy* all the wealth of England to-morrow—we will not talk of 'sharing' it out, but *destroy* it—and establish Socialism on the ruins and the bareness, and in a few years we should have a prosperous, a powerful, and a contented nation."

Now this is the real point. If all that is socially needed is socially owned, and the State possesses all the means of production and distribution, all the

workshops, factories, and stores, it is obvious that wealth in private hands will be without investing value. It could not be invested for the reason that the State would own all the trading undertakings, &c. This being the obvious development of the Blatchford Socialism, it is absurd to describe it as evolutionary. It would, unquestionably, require a revolution to carry it into effect.

Mr. Blatchford's capabilities for drafting a new social scheme may, perhaps, be taken at his own estimation. Writing in the *Clarion* above his signature on September 20, 1907, Mr. Blatchford asks: "Was *Merrie England* a practical book or an idealist book? They (the people) understood *Merrie England*. In those days why did the people listen to me and trust me? Was I ever practical? No. They felt that I loved them, that I stood for something broader and higher and better than mere practical politics."

Yet this country, surely, is a big concern to be run by a man who confesses that he was never practical!

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE POLITICAL SOCIALIST PARTIES AND THE TRADE UNIONS

"The following reports," states *The Social Democrat* for September 1907, "are taken from the volume issued by the International Socialist Bureau:—

"In consequence of a decision of the Bureau (June 9, 1907), the Secretary sent a circular to the affiliated parties in order to obtain from them official notes

on the relations between political parties and trade unions of their country. This circular submitted the following questions:—

"1. *What relation has your political party with the trade unions?*

"2. *Are the trade unions, as groups, affiliated to your political party? Are they paying dues to the party?*

"3. *If trade unions are not directly affiliated as groups, are their members obliged to be also members of the party?*

"4. *Have the central committees of political parties and trade unions joint meetings, to examine questions concerning both?*

"5. *Is any Socialist propaganda made by trade unions among their members?*

"The Secretary had received the following replies on August 1:—

"'*From the Social-Democratic Federation*

"'1. Although from its formation in March 1881 the S.D.F. has strongly opposed the abstention of the older trade unions from politics, and has still more strongly objected to the very close alliance which some of its leading members have made with the capitalist Liberal Party, resulting in high office and even Cabinet rank for those who have thus deliberately betrayed the interests of their fellows and supporters of the working-class; nevertheless, we have never at any time failed to help in every way possible, personally and pecuniarily, every strike which has taken place since 1881 (even in spite of our doubting the value of the mere strike as a weapon

against organised capitalism), and our organisation has invariably agitated in favour of every Parliamentary measure accepted by the trade unions which could at all help the trade unionists and the workers at large. All this was most handsomely acknowledged by Mr. George Barnes, M.P., at a great public meeting held at Hanley during the Trades Union Congress there two years ago. Our relations with the trade unions may therefore be described as friendly whenever they take action against capitalism, and appreciative of their increasing tendency towards Socialism. We always recommend all workers to join the trade union of their trade.

"'2. No.

"'3. No.

"'4. Joint committees of the S.D.F. and the trade unions are frequently formed to organise concerted action as regards such questions as the Unemployed, May-Day celebration, State Maintenance of Children, &c., &c., and the relations thus established have been growing, for many years, increasingly cordial. The members of the S.D.F. were chiefly instrumental in forming up some of the largest, most successful, and most influential of the newer trade unions, whose delegates in their turn have secured the support, by large majorities, of Socialist resolutions introduced and passed at successive annual Trades Union Congresses. These resolutions must shortly pass beyond the phase of mere "pious opinion," and, indeed, are even already producing practical effects.

"'5. No Socialist propaganda is officially carried on by the trade unions, but as quite 75 per cent. of the members of the S.D.F. are also trade unionists

in their respective trades, by their agency Socialist thought is steadily permeating the ranks of trade unionism. As also the older leaders, brought up entirely in the bourgeois school of thought and action, die, or are superannuated, there can be no doubt whatever that they will be succeeded by Socialists, and, in fact, they are being so replaced at the present time. Trade union Socialist leaders, of course, will then use the trade union organisation to spread Socialism. So far as they have been elected to executive office, they do this even now.

"'(Signed) H. W. LEE, *Secretary.*'

"'*From the Labour Party*

"'1. The Labour Party is a federation of Socialist societies and trade union organisations.

"'2. National trade unions—as distinct from local branches—are affiliated to the Labour Party and pay affiliation fees at the rate of 15s. per thousand members, together with contributions for the maintenance of the Parliamentary Party at the rate of 2d. per member per year.

"'3. Trade unions are directly affiliated, their membership forming, together with the membership of the Socialist organisations, the membership of the Labour Party.

"'4. Our annual conferences are meetings of delegates, elected by our affiliated societies in the proportion of one per thousand members, for the consideration of political matters, closely concerning both sections.

"'5. In some cases Socialist propaganda is

conducted by the trade unions, several of them embracing the Socialist basis in their rules.

"'(Signed) J. S. MIDDLETON for
J. RAMSAY MACDONALD.'

"'*From the I.L.P.*

"'1. The Independent Labour Party is affiliated to the Labour Party, which is a federation of Trade Unions, Co-operative Societies, and Socialist Societies for political action.

"'2. The Independent Labour Party consists of individual members and not of federated organisations. Our membership is only open to Socialists individually. Our association with the trade unions comes through the Labour Party, with which both we and they are affiliated.

"'3. Members of trade unions are not obliged to be members of the Independent Labour Party, and, although members of the Independent Labour Party are not obliged to be members of trade unions, they are expected to be, and our branches look with disfavour on men working in a trade to the union of which they do not belong.

"'4. Yes. The Labour Party holds consultative meetings with the General Federation of Trade Unions and the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Congress, which are the two distinctive national trade unions organisations. The joint organisation is permanent, and is called the Joint Board.

"'5. The trade unions in Great Britain do not carry on any specific Socialist propaganda among their members, although several of the unions state

in their constitution that they believe in Socialism. Many Socialist speeches are made from trade union platforms, and demonstrations held under the auspices of trade unions.

"'(Signed) FRANCIS JOHNSON, *Secretary.*'" [1]

REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST ORGANISATIONS

I.—THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION

The first Socialist society to be formed in this country was, as already referred to, the "Democratic Federation," founded in March 1881 by Mr. Hyndman, Mr. Herbert Burrows, and some others. Of this organisation Mr. Sidney Webb writes in his *Socialism in England:* "The only distinctively Socialist proposal explicitly set forth in the first programme of this organisation was 'Nationalisation of the Land,' placed ninth on the list; but it was from the first essentially a Socialist body, and it changed its name in September 1883 to the 'Social Democratic Federation.' Under this title it became a propagandist organisation of great effect in London and many of the provincial industrial centres, having scores of energetic and self-supporting local branches." [2]

The Social Democratic Federation (popularly known as the "S.D.F.") has made a great advance in the direction of out-and-out revolutionary Socialism since the spring of 1881, in which the first programme saw the light.

[1] Extracted from *The Social Democrat* for September 1907, pp. 548–550.
[2] *Socialism in England*, 3rd edition, pp. 22, 23.

The Case against Socialism

The following is the latest official programme of the Social Democratic Federation :—

Programme of the Social Democratic Federation

Object

The Socialisation of the Means of Production, Distribution, and Exchange to be controlled by a Democratic State in the interests of the entire community, and the complete Emancipation of Labour from the Domination of Capitalism and Landlordism, with the establishment of Social and Economic Equality between the Sexes.

Immediate Reforms

Political

Abolition of the Monarchy.

Democratisation of the Governmental machinery, viz. : Abolition of the House of Lords, Payment of Members of Legislative and Administrative Bodies, Payment of Official Expenses of Elections out of the Public Funds, Adult Suffrage, Proportional Representation, Triennial Parliaments, Second Ballot, Initiative and Referendum. Foreigners to be granted rights of citizenship after two years' residence in the country, on the recommendation of four British-born citizens, without any fees. Canvassing to be made illegal.

Legislation by the people in such wise that no legislative proposal shall become law until ratified by the majority of the people.

Legislative and Administrative Independence for all parts of the Empire.

Financial and Fiscal

Repudiation of the National Debt.

Abolition of all indirect taxation and the institution of a cumulative tax on all incomes and inheritances exceeding £300.

Administrative

Extension of the principle of Local Self-Government.

Systematisation and co-ordination of the local administrative bodies.

Election of all administrators and administrative bodies by Equal Direct Adult Suffrage.

Educational

Elementary education to be free, secular, industrial, and compulsory for all classes. The age of obligatory school attendance to be raised to sixteen.

Unification and systematisation of intermediate and higher education, both general and technical, and all such education to be free.

Free maintenance for all attending State schools.

Abolition of school rates; the cost of education in all State schools to be borne by the National Exchequer.

Public Monopolies and Services

Nationalisation of the land and the organisation of Labour in agriculture and industry under public ownership and control on co-operative principles.

Nationalisation of the trusts.

Nationalisation of Railways, Docks, and Canals, and all great means of transit.

Public ownership and control of Gas, Electric Light, and Water supplies, as well as of Tramway, Omnibus, and other locomotive services.

Public ownership and control of the food and coal supply.

The establishment of State and Municipal banks and pawnshops and public restaurants.

Public ownership and control of the lifeboat service.

Public ownership and control of hospitals, dispensaries, cemeteries, and crematoria.

Public ownership and control of the drink traffic.

Labour

A legislative eight-hour working day, or forty-eight hours per week, to be the maximum for all trades and industries. Imprisonment to be inflicted on employers for any infringement of the law.

Absolute freedom of combination for all workers, with legal guarantee against any action, private or public, which tends to curtail or infringe it.

No child to be employed in any trade or occupation until sixteen years of age, and imprisonment to be inflicted on employers, parents, and guardians who infringe this law.

Public provision of useful work at not less than trade-union rates of wages for the unemployed.

Free State Insurance against sickness and accident, and free and adequate State pensions or provision for aged and disabled workers.

Public assistance not to entail any forfeiture of political rights.

The legislative enactment of a minimum wage of 30s. for all workers. Equal pay for both sexes for the performance of equal work.

Social

Abolition of the present work-house system, and reformed administration of the Poor Law on a basis of national co-operation.

Compulsory construction by public bodies of healthy dwellings for the people; such dwellings to be let at rents to cover the cost of construction and maintenance alone, and not to cover the cost of the land.

The administration of justice to be free to all; the establishment of public offices where legal advice can be obtained free of charge.

Miscellaneous

The disestablishment and disendowment of all State churches.

The abolition of standing armies, and the establishment of national citizen forces. The people to decide on peace and war.

The establishment of international courts of arbitration.
The abolition of courts-martial: all offences against discipline to be transferred to the jurisdiction of civil courts.[1]

The foregoing programme of the S.D.F. deserves the very closest study on the part of all those who wish to really understand the doctrines of modern Socialism. It is against these doctrines, if Socialism is to be defeated, that the fight will have to be waged.

It is incumbent, therefore, that the opponents of Socialism should, one and all, clearly recognise the dangerous nature of the enemy against whom they have to contend.

The Social Democratic Federation Method

The repudiation of the National Debt and the abolition of all indirect taxation, and the institution of a cumulative tax on all incomes and inheritances exceeding £300 are only a few of the "reforms" that are necessary "to insure greater material and moral facilities for the working-class to organise itself and to carry on the class war" (see "Programme and Rules").

It will, of course, be noted that these "reforms" are merely *preliminaries* to "the class war." One might well wonder whether there would be anything left to fight for.

Who's Who in the S.D.F.

The leading writers on behalf of this organisation are Messrs. Belfort Bax, Hyndman, and H. Quelch.

[1] Quoted from *Justice*, October 26, 1907.

The weekly journal is *Justice*, and there is also a sixpenny monthly magazine, *The Social Democrat*. The very numerous publications of this body bear the imprint of the Twentieth Century Press.

The S.D.F. is perhaps the most extreme revolutionary Socialist society to-day existing in this country. It absorbs from time to time many members of the I.L.P., who, having passed through their novitiate, are able to stomach the stronger meat. Its branches are to be found in most parts of the United Kingdom, and its meetings are held everywhere.

It should be borne in mind that the Social Democratic Federation is now known as the Social Democratic Party. The change in name is suggestive of even greater and graver aggressiveness.

II.—THE S.P.G.B.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain (usually referred to as the "S.P.G.B.") must speak for itself. It has a separate position of its own, and was, according to its own statement, founded in London on June 12, 1904. We believe that its adherents are less numerous than those of any of the other existing Socialist societies with which we have dealt in the present chapter. Its Manifesto was issued on June 12, 1905, by its Executive Committee, and re-issued as "an historical document," with an appreciative preface, on May 14, 1907.

Having regard to the nature of the contents, we cannot take upon ourselves the responsibility of republishing these efforts, and must content ourselves

with the following official announcement of the aims of this society, viz:—

The Socialist Party of Great Britain

Object

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

The Socialist Party of Great Britain holds:

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (*i.e.* land, factories, railways, &c.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in

order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political Parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the Party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other Party.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political Parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be brought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Suffice it to add that, according to the Manifesto of the S.P.G.B. dated May 14, 1907, "The workers' organisation must be Socialist and all-embracing. . . . Its tactics must be aggressive as well as defensive, and its aim revolutionary."[1]

The address of this organisation is given as 22 Great James' Street, London, W.C.

[1] See p. 4 of this Manifesto.

III

THE REVOLUTIONARY NATURE OF SOCIALISM

It is by means of revolution alone that Socialism can ever be carried into practice. The evolutionary Socialists have realised that the temper of the British people has been hitherto, for the most part, opposed to methods of violence. For this reason they propound a scheme of Socialism by instalments, and have actually conceived of a "transition stage." The bare idea that a condition of *suspended industrial animation* is possible—during the period when the individualist ordering of society is doomed, and before the collective ownership and co-operative working is ushered in—is grotesque in the extreme. Of course, the absence of working capital, as will appear, would necessitate such a suspension.

Let us admit that the landowners will be unable to remove their land, and also that the mills, factories, and workshops, &c., must also remain. Let us admit, too, that the capital invested in these, and in similar, means of production would under the menace of an immediate Socialism prove unrealisable. Yet any "transition stage" would none the less be impossible, for the simple reason that there would be an absence

of working capital with which to carry on the work of the various enterprises.

As recently emphasised by Mr. W. H. Lever, M.P.: "From the very moment that the nation took over the implements of production there would be decay going on, renewal would become necessary, and *capital would again assume its position, and would again be a charge on the undertaking.*" [1]

The transition Government would, of course, be unable to issue loans—even if any one were willing to subscribe for them ; for, if that were done, capital in private hands would receive State recognition and security (for what it might be worth), from the very Government that professed to abolish all capitalists. The Government might, of course, institute a State-guaranteed paper currency. Yet a paper currency which represented merely the pledges of a Socialist Government would be valueless for purposes of international exchange ; whilst at home, in a transition stage at any rate, it would be ruinously discounted as against such specie as might still remain in the country. A "transition stage," of even a week's duration, without working capital, would not survive the first pay-day when there were no wages for the workers.

Socialists make a point of minimising the amount of fluid capital that there is in the country. They ludicrously under-estimate, moreover, the all-important part which is played in our industrial life by the re-investment of a very large portion of the total representing rent and interest. A large proportion of this amount goes, in one form or another, to feed

[1] *The Magazine of Commerce*, October 1907, p. 77.

industry and to renew and supplement the capital that is in constant process of consumption and decline. It is certain, also, that means would be found, from the very moment that the coming of Socialism was seen to be apparently inevitable, to remove, so far as possible, suspense and depreciation funds and industrial working capital generally, whatever the loss might be which was involved in realisation. Thus before even the "transition stage" was within measurable distance, the national industries would have been stripped as bare of removable capital as clever hands could render them.

Socialists frequently assert that Socialism to be effective must be international. Very likely—but it certainly never will at any given period receive universal acceptance. On the face of the inhabitable globe there would still be many areas where capital in exile would continue to reap a rich reward. And if it were ever to return within the sphere of a Socialist Government, it would return on its own terms, and then only at rates commensurate with the possible risks to be incurred.[1]

No pen of man could possibly depict in full the misery and privations which would inevitably supervene in a disorganised "transition stage." The present state of unemployment would be accentuated a thousand-fold, and Socialism's first citizens would be a desperate, workless, starving mob. Indeed, the leaders of the new movement would be fortunate if they escaped a hanging on the nearest lamp-post.

The evolutionary Socialists may, therefore, be

[1] In regard to this subject, pp. 1–80 of Mr. Mallock's powerful work, *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, are deserving of careful study.

dismissed as being mere rose-water theorists who are playing with fire, though possibly in ignorance of the fact. Even if they could answer for their own followers, is it reasonable to imagine that the vast numbers possessed of investments, large or small, will peacefully submit to complete expropriation?

This point has been dealt with by Professor Woolsey. "It seems certain," writes this distinguished authority, "that the change in society *must be effected*, if effected at all, *by violence*. If the Socialists should not wish to appeal to violent measures, such an appeal would come from the partisans of existing society."[1]

Nor in support of the point here raised is it by any means necessary to rely on anti-Socialist sources.

In reference to Marx's prediction that Socialism in England might possibly be attained by peaceful and legal means, Friedrich Engels, in his Preface, dated November 1886, to the English translation of Marx's *Capital*, expressly states that Marx "*certainly never forgot to add that he hardly expected the English ruling classes to submit* without a 'pro-slavery rebellion' to this peaceful and legal revolution."[2]

We have, therefore, the admission of "the founder of modern Socialism" that the advent of Socialism will in all probability be attended by bloodshed and revolution.

On the other hand, the revolutionary Socialists, as shortly will here be shown, anticipate with equanimity, if not with eagerness, an inevitable resort to force.

[1] *Communism and Socialism*, p. 284. [2] Marx's *Capital*, p. xiv.

Will Expropriation be Accompanied by Compensation?

Before we leave the evolutionary Socialists it is necessary to deal with the subject of compensation. It may well be urged that if full compensation were given to the expropriated, the transfer of the land and means of production might prove to be a matter of peaceful arrangement. The outlook with regard to this is, however, far from promising. There are, of course, three principal evolutionary Socialist societies—namely, the Fabians, the Independent Labour Party, and the *Clarion* organisations.

The Fabians do not even propose to give compensation. The utmost which they offer is "such relief to expropriated individuals as may seem fit to the community" (see page 19 of Fabian Tract, No. 7). This, of course, is no sort of a reassuring guarantee, and under a Socialist majority would prove valueless.

The Independent Labour Party's proposal is in no way more favourable. A perusal of Mr. Philip Snowden's *Socialist's Budget*, published only in 1907, will show that the plan of campaign propounded by this section of the Socialist Party is to expropriate by means of taxing out. Expropriation without compensation will, it is submitted, prove to be no less a hardship, for the reason that it is achieved by Parliament through the agency of the super-tax.

The Blatchfordian method is characteristically nebulous and contradictory. We read on page 89 of *Britain for the British* the following: "The land

and railways, collieries, &c., to be bought from the present owners, but not at fancy prices." On page 76 we are told, "First, we do not propose to *seize* anything. We do propose to get some things—the land, for instance—and to make them the property of the whole nation; but we mean that to be done by Act of Parliament and by purchase."

No adequate compensatory scheme is, however, practicable under Socialism. For what is the chief aim of Socialism if it be not to abolish utterly the holding of capital in private hands? The State, therefore, would be forced to prohibit those to whom compensation might be given from either engaging in business, &c., in competition with the State itself, or from living on an income derived from invested capital, having regard to the denunciations of the "idle rich" in which Socialists now habitually indulge.

The important point to note is, that since, under Socialism, all the means of production, distribution, and exchange would belong exclusively to the State, any compensation that might be given could *not* be invested so as to produce for its owner an income.

Any persons, then, who imagine that compensation would be a safeguard against revolution are in error. The so-called evolutionary Socialists are playing a dangerous and deceptive game. They are seeking to enlist under their banners the supporters of peace, and are assuring their adherents that the Socialism which promises so much (on paper) can be achieved without recourse to force, and with the concurrence of those to be expropriated.

Even if, however, every Socialist society in the country were pledged to compensation, there is grave

reason for doubt as to whether any reliance could be placed on their assurances.

On this point the speech of the French Socialist leader, M. Jaurès, delivered in the Chamber of Deputies on June 14, 1906, is highly instructive. The speaker began by admitting that "*it is impossible to tell with certainty* . . . whether the general expropriation of capitalistic property will be carried out with or without compensation."[1] He then proceeded to instance "the great French Revolution, which began with decrees of expropriation with compensation, with the purchase of most of the feudal rights; and which afterwards, carried away and exasperated by the struggle, proceeded to that expropriation *without indemnity*."

In any case, continued M. Jaurès, compensation will only enable the former capitalists "to purchase the products of labour."[2] ". . . *Our goal*," concluded M. Jaurès, "*will ever remain the Revolution*—namely, the complete transformation of the present social system."[3]

The analogy between what actually did happen in the great French Revolution and what might be expected to occur in this country is strikingly emphasised in the following quotation:—

"No doubt," writes Dr. Schäffle, "Socialism is not averse to granting compensation to the present private owners, if they allow themselves to be expropriated with a good grace . . ."[4]

The proposition of compensation according to grace

[1] Translated by E. Hatzfeld, and printed by the Twentieth Century Press, under the title of *Practical Socialism*, p. 2.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 5. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 16.
[4] *The Quintessence of Socialism*. Translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 32.

is merely farcical. The modus may be summed up thus: "Surrender all that you have got, and we will give you some compensation if you do it readily; but we will give you so scanty a measure of compensation that you will *not* be willing to surrender of your own accord. None the less, however, count it to merit that we gave you this option. The inevitable revolution, it must be understood, will, in this case, be upon your own head, and upon yours alone."

This is the course of reasoning to which Socialist speakers to-day continually give utterance. The right is by them all credited to their side. Therefore, all who refuse to conform entirely to their demands must necessarily be in the wrong. *Ergo*, in respect of all future consequences, argue the Socialists, the responsibility must necessarily lie on the opponents of Socialism.

It should not be forgotten that the whole body of revolutionary Socialists in this country utterly scout the idea of giving any compensation at all. And it may be said for them that they are honest in their dishonesty. The basis of their creed is that vested interests and private rights of property are an outrage. That, in a sentence, no one has acquired any property at all without "exploiting" some victim. This being their view, "all property" in their eyes "is theft," and nothing short of it. Why, then they ask, should we give compensation for stolen property? In so doing, we should, so they say, become abettors of the offence.

These extreme views, which are after all the keynote of revolutionary Socialism, are frequently denied

in the Press and elsewhere by those who, for tactical reasons, seek to portray Socialism as pacifically as possible.

It might be well, therefore, to record by way of evidence the following important pronouncement by Mr. Belfort Bax: "*Now, Justice being henceforth identified with confiscation and injustice with the rights of property,* there remains only the question of 'ways and means.' . . . Get what you can that tends in the right direction by Parliamentary means or otherwise, *bien entendu,* the right direction meaning that which curtails the capitalist's power of exploitation. If you choose to ask further how one would like it, the reply is, so far as the present writer is concerned, *one would like it to come as drastically as possible, as the moral effect of sudden expropriation would be much greater than that of any gradual process.*" [1]

The impracticability of compensation may be finally dismissed in the following words of Professor Flint:—

"Collectivism, if it is to start with purchase, or, in other words, with the honest acquisition of the capital of individuals, *presupposes that a stupendous miracle will be wrought* to bring it into existence." [2]

"If we only capture Parliament, Parliament can do anything." This is the stereotyped assurance of the evolutionary Socialists. Yes, but a revolution is no whit less sanguinary and merciless to minorities, for the reason that it is sanctioned or engineered by Parliament.

This point is ably expressed by Professor Flint:

[1] *The Ethics of Socialism,* 1902 edition, p. 82.
[2] *Socialism,* by Professor Flint, p. 232.

"If Socialists so increase as to be able to elect a majority of the members of the House of Commons, the whole Socialistic programme may be constitutionally converted into law, and constitutionally carried into effect *at the point of the bayonet*. Thus far Marx saw quite clearly. And, possibly, the time may come when the people of Britain will be so infatuated as to send to Parliament a Socialist majority."[1]

Socialism would Suppress all Opposition

The considerate measures that are promised for the protection of the huge minority that is certain to exist if ever Socialism be put into practice are significantly indicated by Professor Karl Pearson, one of the most intellectual leaders of Socialist thought in England, in the following words:—

"Socialists have to inculcate that spirit which would give offenders against the State short shrift and the nearest lamp-post."[2]

Mr. Belfort Bax, the prominent and prolific Social Democratic writer, develops this point, and promises the complete trampling under foot of the hapless minority. This negation of justice and tolerance to men—who after all may be wholly correct in their views and judgment—would not be tolerated under any scheme of Government in the civilised world to-day.

It is notable that in our Colonies and Dependencies we, as a nation, take elaborate and costly precautions for the safeguarding of the interests and rights of

[1] *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, pp. 336, 337.
[2] *The Ethics of Free-thought*, p. 324.

subject races, however inferior their civilisation may be. This is achieved by "Protectors," and, indeed, by direct native representation on representative assemblies. In the British House of Commons the Opposition is granted "facilities," and it usually discharges most useful functions by way of criticism and otherwise.

Under Socialism the Socialists are to be *the* people and no one else is to count. As Mr. Belfort Bax writes:—

"The only public opinion, the only will of the majority, which has any sort of claim on the recognition of the Socialist in the present day, is that of the majority of those who have like aspirations with him, who have a definite consciousness of certain aims — in other words, the will of the majority of the European Socialist Party."[1]

It must be remembered, of course, that Mr. Belfort Bax is no unattached doctrinaire, but, on the contrary, has been accepted for some years as the chief publicist of the Social Democratic Federation in this country. His works are acclaimed by the tens of thousands of members of this body as representing the true gospel of militant Socialism. The following further passage, then, from this author's writings is highly significant.

Mr. Belfort Bax writes: "The practical question finally presents itself, What is the duty of the convinced Socialist towards the present mechanical majority—say of the English nation—a majority mainly composed of human cabbage-stalks, the growth of the suburban villa and the slum respectively?

[1] *Ethics of Socialism*, p. 122. By E. Belfort Bax.

The answer is, Make use of it wherever possible without loss of principle, but where this is not possible disregard it. The Socialist has a distinct aim in view. If he can carry the *initial* stages towards its realisation by means of the count-of-heads majority, by all means let him do so. If, on the other hand, he sees the possibility of carrying a salient portion of his programme by trampling on this majority, by all means let him do this also."[1]

"The human cabbage-stalks" are to be "made use of" when agreeable; otherwise, they are to be "disregarded" and "trampled upon."

In the previous passage we learnt that minorities would receive no protection; here we have the intimation that there is to be no security, even for majorities. They are dubbed "mechanical." The people's will and the people's vote are of no account. The Socialist caucus is the sole possessor of the rights of rule.

We find, then, that there is to be *no* toleration for opposition in the Socialist State; and, more than that, that "mechanical majorities" are to be disregarded. And, if you please, it is in the name of Freedom that this tyrannical bureaucracy is to be established, and the existing forms of Government are to be entirely suppressed.

Evolutionary Socialism in Theory and Practice

An amazing amount of misapprehension and loose thinking centre around evolutionary Socialism. There are some evolutionary Socialists who believe,

[1] *Ethics of Socialism*, pp. 127, 128.

at all events professedly, that the Socialism of their acceptance will be realised bloodlessly, by instalments —with here a point gained and there a point scored, extending over a considerable lapse of time. Socialism on these lines would, however, be self-subversive. Palliatives and instalments would tend to undermine that popular discontent upon which a complete Socialism can alone be grounded. It is clear, also, that the leaders of the evolutionary Socialists are not practising what they preach.

"Of course, we all know that Socialism will not come in *our* time," is the assuring platform statement. But what is at present happening? Scores of Socialist candidates are being put forward in this country; branches of the evolutionary organisations are being opened everywhere; thousands of meetings are being held week after week, and the most strenuous efforts are being made by these evolutionary Socialists to secure, if possible, a Socialist Ministry within the next few years.

If evolutionary Socialism were true to its name, it would indicate an advance, in sympathy with the shaping of events and forces. The chief essential would be the gradual evolution of that individual perfection without which Socialism in practice *must* fail. As a matter of fact this Socialism is *evolutionary only in name.* In practice, it would prove to be every whit as revolutionary as the proposals of the Social Democratic Federation.

"Social Democracy," declared Herr Liebknecht, a Socialist leader of international fame, at the Socialist Congress held at Berlin in November 1892, "has nothing in common with the so-called State Socialism,

a system of half measures dictated by fear and aiming merely at undermining the hold of Social Democracy over the working-classes by petty concessions and palliatives."[1]

Mr. Rae, whose knowledge of international Socialism is unrivalled, in his introductory chapter to *Contemporary Socialism* writes: "Non-political Socialism may be said to have practically disappeared. Not only so, but out of the several sorts and varieties of political Socialism only one has revived in any strength, and that is *the extremest and most revolutionary*. . . . It scouts the very suggestion of State help, and will content itself with nothing short of State transformation."[2]

Modern Socialism, further states Mr. Rae, "is contended for as an object of *immediate* accomplishment—if possible, by ordinary constitutional means; *but, if not, by revolution*."[3]

The present-day so-called "evolutionary" Socialist one moment contends that Socialism is coming because it must come. The next that Socialism must come because it is coming.

The believers in a creed self-styled "scientific" have hitherto declined to elect to which of these mutually contradictory formulæ they will adhere.

Not even now have Socialists as a body abandoned the teaching of Karl Marx and Engels, to the effect that all-powerful historical evolution is bringing about a Socialistic revolution consequent on the accomplishment of two processes necessarily

[1] Quoted in Mr. W. D. P. Bliss' *Handbook of Socialism*, p. 8.
[2] P. 2, 3rd edition.
[3] *Contemporary Socialism*, p. 3.

accompanying (according to this teaching) modern industrialism.

These two processes, which still form the staple commodity of most Socialist platforms, are (1) the concentration of production into the hands of an ever fewer number of capitalists, now usually designated "Trustification" by Socialists; (2) that "the rich are growing richer and the poor poorer." On this latter doctrine is founded "the class war."

Evolution, however, was *never* regarded, by many of the leaders at any rate, *as a substitute* for revolution. It was merely held by those who shared these opinions that the proper moment for the revolutionary inauguration of the Socialist State was being inevitably accelerated by these two processes.

No graver mistake, therefore, could be made in diagnosing Socialism than to regard evolutionary Socialists (*so-called*) *as opposed to revolutionary methods.* The whole gospel of "the class war," as commonly preached by Socialists in England as in other countries, is a direct and malicious incitement to the ignorant to adopt revolutionary methods.

One of the most favoured methods in use is that of drenching the employing and more wealthy classes with invective and abuse. In Socialist terminology every one who does not belong to the labouring class is not merely dubbed as belonging to the "idle rich," but he is described as being effete, debased, and steeped in vice. In the manner in which they preach "the class war," evolutionary Socialists closely rival, even if they do not always equal, the members of the revolutionary organisations.

Socialism remains to-day, as it ever has been, revolutionary *both in its aims and principles.*

"Many later Socialists of great influence," writes Mr. Thomas Kirkup, "have laid excessive stress on revolution as the lever of social progress."[1]

This represents a strictly accurate historical summary. It is noteworthy, too, that it is the admission of the most eminent Socialist historian of Socialism in England.

The idea that we are to glide comfortably into Socialism on the stream of time is *not* seriously believed in by even the chief evolutionary Socialists themselves.

"Thus the coming struggle between 'haves' and 'have nots,'" writes Mr. Hubert Bland, one of the present officials of the Fabian Society, "will be a conflict of parties, each perfectly conscious of what it is fighting about and fully alive to the life and death importance of the issues at stake."[2]

We have already here briefly alluded to the doctrine of "the class war," and the manner in which it is habitually preached by evolutionary and revolutionary Socialists alike.

In such a propagandism there is very grave danger to the peace of the community, and for this among other reasons. If the more ignorant sections of the masses come to believe that those who stand between themselves and the promised loot are effete and incapable of resistance, they may imagine that the risks of a conflict are reduced to a minimum. Might it not be well to remind those to whom these

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 276.
[2] *Fabian Essays*, p. 204.

Socialist diatribes are addressed, that this so-called effete class is, after all, the same class which officers both our Army and Navy? Heroism and endurance did not die on Spion Kop. Nor, as the South African War abundantly proved, are these qualities as yet on the wane in this country.

Will Socialism be Installed without a Revolution?

The improbability, nay, impossibility, of Socialism attaining its ends, except by the use of force, is sufficiently evidenced by the following words of Professor Woolsey, whose historical examination into Socialism still ranks as one of the principal.

"There never was a revolution in history, since history told the story of the world, so complete as this," [1] namely, that which Socialism to-day proposes to effect.

"Nothing, in fact, but persuasion or violent revolution," continues Professor Woolsey in a later passage, "can lead holders of property . . . to acquiesce in so complete an overturning of society, and downfall of themselves, as the modern Socialism contemplates." [2]

Surely common sense supports this view, which, as we have already here shown, was shared in by no less a person than Karl Marx.

In the conclusion which he here seeks to enforce, Professor Woolsey is to a large extent supported by two of the leading writers of the Social Democratic Federation of Great Britain.

[1] *Communism and Socialism*, p. 228. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 280.

"Socialism is," declare Mr. Belfort Bax and Mr. H. Quelch, "essentially revolutionary, politically and economically, as it aims at the complete overthrow of existing economic and political conditions."[1]

Dispossession will never come without a struggle on the part of those who are to be excluded from the enjoyment of what they have been brought up to believe is theirs by right. Nor is it reasonable to expect that property-owners, large or small, will, on their side, placidly surrender at the bidding of Socialist demagogues. It is noteworthy that other Socialists besides Marx have committed themselves to an expression of the same belief.

In view of the fact that at the present time, with the express object of disarming opposition, much "watering down" is being done by large numbers of Socialist speakers and writers in Great Britain, the following admissions of prominent English Socialists will be of value.

Mr. Thomas Kirkup, in what is usually admitted to be the leading English history of Socialism from the Socialist standpoint, checkmates these tactics and frankly admits: "The prevailing Socialism of the day is in large part based on the frankest and most outspoken revolutionary materialism."[2]

Even more instructive is the following Socialist statement.

". . . The one aim of Socialism being the victory of the revolutionary principle," writes Mr. Belfort Bax, "*any means which would be conducive to that end would of necessity be adopted.*"[3]

[1] *A New Catechism of Socialism*, p. 33.
[2] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 10.
[3] *Ethics of Socialism*, p. 64.

Again, writes the same author, "For him" (the Socialist) "*it is indifferent whether social and political ends are realised by lawful or lawless means.*" [1]

Mr. H. M. Hyndman thus attempts to dispose of the charge that Socialism involves a revolutionary attack on property. In his *Socialism made Plain* he writes: "Do any say we attack property? We deny it. We attack only the private property of *a few thousand loiterers and slave-drivers*, which renders all property in the fruits of their own labour impossible for millions." [2]

It is these exaggerated word-pictures which, by encouraging a contempt of the opposite side, tend to vastly increase the probability of a sanguinary struggle in Great Britain between the supporters and opponents of Socialism. Moreover, when we find such language habitually employed by the *leaders* of the movement, it necessarily follows that the smaller agitators seek to surpass their chiefs in the virulence of their abuse.

Again, Mr. Hyndman, in *The Single Tax versus Social Democracy*, states: "Mr. George says, 'How are you going to take them' (the railways)? 'Well, friends and fellow-citizens, by vote if possible, *by force if necessary*. And *precisely the same thing applies to rent*. How are you going to take the rent? By vote if possible, *by force if necessary*.'" [3]

It will be seen, therefore, that Mr. Hyndman lends but little support to the evolutionary theory.

Mr. James Leatham, another prominent English

[1] *Ethics of Socialism*, p. 71.
[2] Quoted in *Property and Progress*, by W. H. Mallock, p. 117.
[3] Published by the Twentieth Century Press, p. 28.

Socialist, writes: "He that comes to the world with a message bearing in it the promise and potency of great and far-reaching changes is a revolutionist; and *the methods of revolution are and ever must be of the nature of war.*" [1]

"Those who talk of the Gospel of Love," further states Mr. Leatham, "with landlordism and capitalism for its objects, want us to make our peace with iniquity." [2]

". . . We are all in favour of political action. *We are not so foolish as to say,*" writes Mr. H. M. Hyndman, "*we would not use force if it would bring us to a better period more rapidly.* We do not say we are such men of peace." [3]

Socialist literature in the United Kingdom provides an abundant supply of incitements to revolution.

In *The Historical Basis of Socialism in Ireland*, one of the pamphlets of the "Socialist Party of Ireland," Mr. Thomas Brady concludes by saying: "No man should imperil his life foolishly. It is criminal to do so. Should the democracy again be driven to resort to force, they shall be so well organised, disciplined, and equipped, that every possibility of failure shall be eliminated. In the words of a well-known Irish Socialist" (continues this Socialist writer), "'*Rebellion shall be no longer the politics of despair, but the very science of Revolution.*'" [4]

One of the most prominent leaders of the French Collectivist Party, M. Gabriel Deville, in a preface to a French translation of Marx's *Capital* (published

[1] *The Class War*, p. 3.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[3] *Social Democracy*, by H. M. Hyndman, p. 22.
[4] P. 16.

in 1883), thus expressed his views on the subject of the means by which Socialism is to be brought about.

Force alone, according to M. Deville, *can effect the Revolution;* the occasion for its successful exercise will arise in the inevitable political and economical troubles that are manifestly impending over Europe; and, in order to avail themselves of it, *the proletariat must make use of all the means of destruction which modern science can furnish.*[1] According to the same authority, universal suffrage can never prove a substitute for force, or effect the emancipation of the working-classes.[2]

In respect of this and the following quotation, it may be well once again here to emphasise that, owing to the international character of Socialism, and to the claim universally put forward by Socialists themselves, that their creed is international, it is *not* competent for English Socialists to disclaim (when deemed convenient) the doctrines enunciated by their Continental leaders.

Few leaders of recent years have exercised greater influence on the Socialist movement than has Herr Bebel, the great German Socialist.

"We aim," has stated Herr Bebel in the Reichstag (March 31, 1881), "in the domain of politics, at Republicanism; in the domain of economics at Socialism; and in the domain of what is to-day called religion at Atheism." "There are *only two ways of attaining our economic ends*," further writes

[1] Quoted in Professor Lecky's *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 343.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 347.

Herr Bebel. "The one is the gradual supplanting of the private undertakers by means of legislation when the democratic State has been established. . . . *The other, and decidedly shorter, though also violent way, would be forcible expropriation*—the abolition of private undertakers at one stroke, *irrespective of the means to be employed.* . . . There is no need to be horrified at this possible use of force, or to cry 'murder' at the suppression of rightful existences, at forcible expropriation, and so forth. *History teaches that, as a rule, new ideas only assert themselves through a violent struggle between their representatives and the representatives of the past.* . . ."[1]

To revert to the utterances of Socialists in this country, what could be franker than the following statement of Mr. Hyndman?

". . . Chemistry has placed at the disposal of the desperate and the needy cheap and powerful explosives, the full effects of which are as yet unknown. Every day adds new discoveries in this field; the dynamite of ideas is accompanied in the background by the dynamite of material force. These modern explosives may easily prove to capitalism what gunpowder was to feudalism."[2]

Equally instructive is the following, which figured among the resolutions carried at the International Revolutionary Congress held in London in July 1881:—

"For the attainment of the end kept in view, namely, the annihilation of all rulers, ministers, the nobility, the clergy, the chief capitalists and other

[1] Dawson's *Lassalle and German Socialism*, pp. 286–287.
[2] *Historical Basis of Socialism*, by Mr. H. M. Hyndman, p. 443.

exploiters, *every means is allowed;* and therefore careful attention, especially to the study of chemistry and the preparation of explosives as the most effective weapons, is recommended." [1]

"Force," declared Karl Marx, "is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one." [2]

Such was the creed of the principal apostle of modern English Socialism, and such is the creed of the vast majority of his followers in this country to-day.

Again, if we turn to the writings of Karl Marx, we find that the celebrated Socialist "Manifesto of the Communist Party," as jointly drafted by Marx and Engels, terminated with these words:—

"The Communists do not seek to conceal their views and aims. *They declare openly that their purpose can only be obtained by a violent overthrow of all existing arrangements of society. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communistic revolution.* The proletariat have nothing to lose in it but their chains; they have a world to win."

Not only do Socialist leaders speak openly of revolution, and find apparent satisfaction in the possibilities of explosives, but we actually find that they turn to Paris and the barricades, and accept the historic methods of the great French Revolution as illustrative of what they have in their minds for the shaping of events in this country.

Thus we may expressly claim that the Paris Commune of 1871 affords an instructive example of the methods by which Socialists seek in practice to

[1] Quoted in Dr. Zacher's *Red International*, translated by Rev. E. M. Geldart, pp. 67, 68.

[2] Quoted in Professor Lecky's *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 348.

obtain, and afterwards to retain, the reins of power and of government.

Further, the General Council of the Socialist Society known as the International at London, after the destruction of the Commune, published a manifesto which, by palliating the crimes there perpetrated by the Communists or Socialists, thereby in effect expressed its approval of these same actions.

This manifesto, written by Karl Marx on behalf of the General Council of the International (*inter alia*), declared, "The Paris of the workers with its Commune will ever be celebrated as the glorious herald of a new society." [1]

In the German Reichstag, Herr Bebel, the leader of the German Social Democratic Party, and one of the most influential leaders of International Socialism, thus referred to the downfall of this same Paris Commune of 1871: "And if Paris is for the present crushed, I remind you that the struggle in Paris is only a small affair of outposts, that the main conflict in Europe is still before us, and that ere many decades pass away the battle-cry of the Parisian proletariat, war to the palace, peace to the cottage, death to want and idleness, will be the battle-cry of the *entire* European proletariat." [2]

The revolting murder of the Archbishop of Paris and other hostages, in defiance of the most elementary principles of civilisation, which took place during the Commune of 1871, constitutes a standing witness to the methods of Socialism.

[1] Quoted in Mr. Thomas Kirkup's *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 188.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 212.

Yet this very Commune still provides the theme of various English Socialist publications, and is deemed to-day a highly instructional subject from the Socialist standpoint.

The extent to which English Social Democrats, in particular, are permeated with the Marxian theories, is illustrated by the following extract from a publication entitled *The Socialist Catechism*, reprinted from *Justice*, the weekly organ of the Social Democratic Federation in this country.

In what is headed "New and Revised Edition" of this well-known pamphlet occur these words from the pen of Mr. J. L. Joynes, the author of *The Socialist Catechism*:—

"*Q.* What is the revolution for which Socialists strive? *A.* A revolution which will render impossible the individual appropriation of the products of associated labour, and consequent exploitation and enslavement of the labourers. . . ."

"*Q. How are forms of government changed so as to readjust them to the economical changes in the forms of production which have been silently evolving in the body of society? A. By means of revolutions. Q. Give an instance of this? A. The French Revolution of* 1789."[1]

The full significance of this latter answer is not difficult to appreciate for those who are at all familiar with the contents of Carlyle's great work, *The French Revolution*.

We desire, in view of the above answer from *The Socialist Catechism*, to here call attention to a further comment from the Socialist historian and writer, Mr. Thomas Kirkup.

[1] *The Socialist Catechism*, p. 16 (The Twentieth Century Press).

According to Marx's latest teaching, writes Mr. Kirkup in his *History of Socialism*, "a great revolutionary catastrophe is to close the capitalistic era, and *this must be regarded as a very bad preparation for the time of social peace which is forthwith to follow.*" [1]

It is of interest here to note that the class which is to accomplish this revolution Marx himself describes as "degenerate."

The importance of revolution—one might almost write, the divine mission of revolution—is eloquently emphasised by Mr. Belfort Bax in the following passage :—

"When that (*i.e.* the revolutionary) crisis comes, the great act of confiscation will be the seal of the new era; then and not till then will the knell of civilisation, with its rights of property and its class society, be sounded; then, and not till then, will Justice—the Justice *not* of Civilisation but of Socialism—become the corner-stone of the Social arch." [2]

Finally, those who cling to the delusive hope that the world may be transformed without bloodshed into one vast Socialist State, may do well to ponder over the fact that the possibility of a peaceful revolution was described by the *Sozial-Demokrat*, the official organ of the German Socialist Party, in its issue of February 20, 1881, as "*a Utopia.*" [3]

"Moreover, the Social Democrats of England," as writes Mr. G. H. Orpen, "are never tired of asserting—what, indeed, is sufficiently obvious—that

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 160.
[2] *The Ethics of Socialism*, pp. 82, 83.
[3] *L'Internationale Rouge*, by Dr. Zacher, translated by the Rev. E. M. Geldart, p. 21.

a forcible revolution will be necessary before they can try their Collectivist scheme."[1]

Certainly the present-day English "Socialist Song Book" lends no support to the Utopian view of a peaceful revolution. From this we quote as follows:—

> "Teach the vile bloodsuckers who are the stronger,
> When workers and robbers confronted shall stand,
> . . . . . .
> They'll know full soon the kind of vermin
> Our bullets hit in this last fight."

The Connection between Socialism and Anarchism

After reading the foregoing proofs of the existence of a revolutionary party in this country, one may be tempted to ask what (if any) is the division between these extremists and the Anarchists? We are aware, of course, that the Socialists are ever ready to repudiate any such association. They hasten to assert that there is a fundamental distinction between Socialism and Anarchism. The one, they assure us, is a scientific and elaborate Collectivism, while the other is merely riotous Individualism.

Mr. W. D. P. Bliss, for instance, in his well-known *Handbook on Socialism*, asserts:—

"From the day when Karl Marx and Bakunin, after the Congress of the International at the Hague in 1872, led their forces into separate camps of Anarchists and Socialists, the two parties have never worked together."[2]

[1] *Socialism of To-day*, p. 323.

[2] P. 16.

In this connection, however, we may point out that the only question of principle which still to-day separates Anarchism from Socialism is the form of government which is to ultimately prevail. "*In other respects*," as states Mr. Rae, in his able comparison between the two, "*Anarchism may be said to be but an extremer phase of Socialism.*"[1]

The similarity between the two parties loses nothing in point of interest by the vehement disclaimer on the part of English Socialists as to the connection.

In the following passage, Mr. Rae conclusively proves how closely the tenets of the two parties resemble each other. "Mr. Hyndman and other Socialists would fain disclaim the Anarchists altogether, and are fond of declaring that they are the very opposite of Socialists—that they are individualists of the boldest stamp. But this contention will *not* stand. There are individualist Anarchists, no doubt . . . but these individualist Anarchists are very few in number anywhere, and the mass of the party whose deeds made a stir on both sides of the Atlantic is undoubtedly more Socialist than the Socialists themselves. . . . The Socialism of the present day may be correctly described in three words as *Revolutionary Socialist Democracy*, and in every one of these three characteristics the Anarchists go beyond other Socialists, instead of falling short of them. . . . They are more Socialist, because they are disposed to want not only common property and common production, but common enjoyment of products as well. They are more Democratic, because they will have

[1] *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 4.

no government of any kind over the people except the people themselves—no king or committee, no representative institutions, either imperial or local, but merely every little industrial group of people managing its public affairs as it will manage its industrial work. And they are more revolutionary, for they have no faith, even temporarily, in constitutional procedure, and think making a little trouble is always the best way of bringing on a big revolution." [1]

The affinity between the two creeds is, as Mr. Rae further proceeds to point out, reluctantly admitted by Dr. and Mrs. Aveling, two well-known English Socialist writers, the latter of whom was a daughter of Karl Marx, the founder of modern Socialism.

In their *Labour Movement in America*, these two prominent Socialist writers admit "well nigh every word spoken by the chief defendants at the Chicago trial could be endorsed by Socialists. . . . Indeed, he that will compare the fine speech by Parsons in 1886 with that of Liebknecht at the high treason trial at Leipzig will find the two *practically identical*." [2]

A few years prior to 1886 another great Anarchist trial, namely, the Lyons trial of 1883, also went to prove the close affinity which exists between Socialism and Anarchism. In the course of this trial it was demonstrated that the economic basis of Anarchism is "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." Absolute Equality and the abolition of all private property were further shown to be included among the cardinal principles

[1] *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, pp. 247, 248.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 249.

of Anarchism. With the result that to-day, as Mr. Thomas Kirkup admits: "*Economically, Anarchism is Collectivism . . . its Collectivism is common to it with the prevalent Socialism. . . .*"[1]

The Impracticability of Socialism in no way disproves the Probability that Socialism must be effected by Means of Revolution

Large numbers of anti-Socialists, having satisfied their own minds that Socialism as a system is impossible, fall into the popular fallacy of believing that the growth of Socialism is consequently unattended by serious dangers. The proof of the former furnishes, unfortunately, *no* ground whatsoever for this latter deduction.

"Social Democracy," states Dr. Schäffle, "is undoubtedly dangerous because of the fearful disturbance in which it might culminate, *even though*, as an enduring social system in the future, it is entirely without a prospect."[2]

Dr. Schäffle again emphasises the same important facts when he states, "Scientific criticism can only prove that the enduring realisation of the Social Democratic State of the future is entirely out of the question—*it cannot disprove the possibility of a successful attempt being made to start an experiment in it through some violent upheaval of the proletariat.*"[3]

This is the contingency against which it is so eminently necessary for the opponents of Socialism

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 247.
[2] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 186.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

to provide, so far as lies in their power. To attempt to ignore the existence of Socialism is but to play *directly* into the enemies' hands.

Meantime it should be remembered that the proof of the impracticability of Socialism as a system in no way disproves the conclusion here sought to be enforced, namely, that the advent of Socialism can, in all probability, only be effected by means of a revolution.

The Advance of Socialism should be Opposed, not Ignored

Should any one, being disturbed by the evidence contained in this chapter as to the revolutionary nature of Socialism, attempt to find consolation in the belief that Englishmen are too sensible to become revolutionaries, he would do well to remember that this view is *not* shared by many of the Socialist leaders.

Mr. Onslow Yorke, in his *Secret History of the International*, publishes one of the confidential documents issued some years ago by a leader of the International Society. In this it was urged that the headquarters of the Society should be removed to London, on the ground that "England is the only country in which a real Socialist revolution can be made." England, the writer of this document stated, is the one country in which the landed property has fallen into the fewest hands. "It is the one country in which a vast majority consists of people paid by wages. It is the one country where the war of classes and the organisation of trade unions have acquired a certain degree of maturity."

Surely the correctness of this opinion has been proved by the great strides that revolutionary Socialism has made, and is to-day making, both in England and in Scotland.

The Social Democratic Federation speakers do not merely carry the vote at their countless meetings, but they exercise a great and growing influence at the polls.

In view of the fact that the very first of their "reforms," immediately required, includes "*the abolition of the monarchy*," we feel that it is idle to-day to deny that revolutionary Socialism has a definite aim, which is accepted and advanced by scores of thousands in this country at the present time. It would, in consequence, be a criminal act of folly to ignore this grave evidence of the progress of its propaganda.

In conclusion we would wish to add one further word. Those who without attempting to inquire personally into the extent and nature of present-day Socialism in Great Britain, yet feel tempted to summarily dismiss the subject as impracticable and as undeserving their attention, may not inaptly be reminded that when Rousseau's *Contrat Social* was first published, it was similarly pronounced by the aristocrats and ruling men of France as mere theorising which need not in any way concern them. Yet, as Carlyle cynically observed, it was "their skins which went to bind the second edition of the book."

IV

INTERNATIONAL & ANTI-NATIONAL CHARACTER OF SOCIALISM

SOCIALISM AND THE MONARCHY

International and Anti-National Character

For the past sixty years Internationalism and Anti-Nationalism have constituted throughout the world two of the principal characteristics of Socialism. Into these channels modern Socialism is to-day more and more tending. It is to the influence of Karl Marx, who is usually admitted to be the chief founder of modern Socialism, that these two attributes are principally traceable.

In a pamphlet entitled *The Social Democratic Federation: Its Objects, its Principles, and its Work*, written for the Social Democratic Federation, Mr. H. Quelch, one of the most prominent of English Socialists, writes: "Recognising the class war, the S.D.F. stands for the international unity and solidarity of the working class against the international capitalist class. . . . *The conflict of the present and of the immediate future is not between the people of different countries, but between the two great classes. Socialists*, therefore, are opposed to war

between nations, and *are the foes of what generally passes for patriotism, and of all forms of imperialism.*" [1]

"It was the great object of Marx," wrote Professor Lecky, "to denationalise the working classes, obliterating all feelings of distinctive patriotism, and uniting them by the bond of common interests, common aspirations, and common sympathies in a great league for the overthrow of the capitalist and middle class." [2]

Nor in proof of our present assertion is it necessary to rely upon the utterances of anti-Socialists. The writings of Marx and of his lifelong assistant, Friedrich Engels, abundantly prove this to be the case.

In the famous manifesto of the Communist Party, drawn up jointly by Marx and Engels and published shortly before the Revolution of 1848, the charge of abolishing patriotism is repudiated by the authors on the ground that the workman has no country. "The old motto of the League," states Engels in an introduction to a subsequent edition of this manifesto, "'All men are brethren,' was replaced by the new battle-cry 'Proletarians of all lands unite,' *which openly proclaimed the international character of the struggle.*" [3]

This manifesto, be it noted, still to-day remains one of the most celebrated expositions of the Socialist creed. Translations of it in most of the principal languages have been extensively circulated throughout the civilised world.

[1] Page 13.
[2] *Democracy and Liberty.* Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 290.
[3] Quoted in Mr. Kirkup's *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, pp. 175 and 176.

International and Anti-National

Of the forms of Socialism, Mr. Thomas Kirkup, the English Socialist historian, records that: "The most powerful and most philosophic, that of Karl Marx, aimed at superseding the existing governments by a vast international combination of the workers of all nations, without distinction of creed, colour, or nationality." [1]

If the history of modern Socialism be carefully traced through the past sixty years, the international character of Socialism becomes throughout plainly visible.

The celebrated Programme of the Gotha Socialist Congress of 1875 recognises the international character of the working-class movement.

"Though the International is dead," writes Mr. Kirkup, in referring to the celebrated Socialist International League, "*its* spirit is still living." [2] The international character of Socialism is, we agree, by no means dead, nor can it ever die as long as Socialism exists, since internationalism is an integral characteristic of modern Socialism.

Socialism is profoundly anti-national and anti-imperial, and is not merely passive in its attitude towards these important questions. The forces of Socialism are actively directed to breaking down all national boundaries and partitions. Its endeavour is to divide societies *not horizontally but diagonally*. This important point cannot be too clearly emphasised.

That such is frankly admitted by English and other Socialists alike to be the case is sufficiently evidenced by the following quotations.

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 6. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

The Case against Socialism

The manifesto of the Joint-Committee of the (English) Socialist bodies clearly demonstrates that the goal of Socialism is international in character. "Municipalisation, for instance," states this manifesto, "can only be accepted as Socialism on the condition of its forming a part of national, and, at last, of *international Socialism* in which the workers of all nations, while adopting within the borders of their own countries those methods which are rendered necessary by their historic development, can federate upon a common basis."

This manifesto is signed on behalf of the Social Democratic Federation, the Fabian Society, and the Hammersmith Socialist Society, and in addition by most of the prominent leaders of English Socialism.[1]

The American Socialist Programme also enforces the essential need for international action.

"If the world is to be saved from chaos, from universal disorder, and from misery," states the National Programme of the Socialist Party of America, adopted by the Chicago convention, 1904, "it must be by the union of the workers of all nations in the Socialist movement."[2]

Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P., in one of his most recently published works, *From Serfdom to Socialism*, personally emphatically affirms the international and anti-national nature of Socialism: "And now in the international Socialist movement we are at last in the presence of a force which is gathering unto itself the rebel spirits of all lands and uniting them

[1] See Bliss' *Handbook of Socialism*, pp. 5 and 6. The manifesto was published in pamphlet form in May 1893.

[2] Quoted in Mr. John Spargo's *Socialism*, p. 247.

into a mighty host to do battle, not for the triumph of a sect or of a race, but for the overthrow of a system which has filled the world with want and woe. 'Workers of the world unite,' wrote Karl Marx . . ."[1]

Again, asserts the French Socialist leader, M. Jaurès: " . . . It is only by a collective act of the whole national proletariat, *associated with the whole international proletariat*, that you can overthrow universal servitude, and substitute for it the organisation of the *universal proletariat*."[2]

This feeling of internationalism on the part of Socialists does not fail to exercise an important bearing on their action in regard to current political questions, both in this as in other countries. The following illustration in regard to one of the political questions which has now for some years past powerfully agitated the two older political Parties in Great Britain, demonstrates to how great an extent this is the case.

Socialism and the Fiscal Question

In *Social Democracy and the Zollverein*, Mr. H. W. Lee (Secretary of the Social Democratic Federation of Great Britain) puts forward what is the present attitude of Socialism in Great Britain towards the Tariff question. "Social Democrats cannot," so Mr. Lee explicitly informs us, "take sides" in the present controversy. "The discussions on Free Trade and Protection are *merely battles between the*

[1] *From Serfdom to Socialism*, p. 86.
[2] *Socialism*. By Jean Jaurès. Translated by H. Quelch, p. 5. (The Twentieth Century Press.)

kites and the crows. . . . International Social Democracy will know no tariff walls, and will require no impost duties. Organised production for use will take the place of competitive production for profit. All being both producers and consumers, there will be no vested interests to serve, no commercial profits to protect. . . . *We must always be opposed to the capitalist Free Traders*, who profess to look after the interests of the workers by securing to them cheap food, whereas they are really concerned only with the cheapness of the labour supply, as they are with the supply of all other raw material." [1]

In view of an authoritative statement such as the above, it appears childish in the extreme for either the advocates of Free Trade or of Tariff Reform in this country to claim, as is so constantly the case at the present time, avowed Socialists as being in support of their policy.

"Free Trade has exhausted its resources ; even Manchester doubts this its quondam economic gospel," wrote Friedrich Engels in a preface, dated November 5, 1886, to the English translation of Marx's *Das Kapital*.[2]

In the present Fiscal controversy what the British Socialist principally sees is a golden opportunity to advance the spread of his own doctrines, while the two older political Parties of the State are so much occupied in wrestling with each other as to have but little time in which to actively oppose the Socialist advance.

[1] *Social Democracy and the Zollverein* (published by the Twentieth Century Press), pp. 14–15.
[2] Page xiii. Marx's *Capital*.

Socialism and Anti-Patriotism

British Socialists have made no efforts to disguise their attitude in regard to the sentiments of Imperialism and of Patriotism. The duty of the Socialist is *not* to "think Imperially," but to concentrate his mind on an ever-present "class war," and never to lose sight of the doctrine that his own countrymen, unless Socialists, are his worst enemies.

Mr. Belfort Bax, whose authority to speak on behalf of English Socialism ranks second to none, furnishes us with the following explicit statement: "For the Socialist the word frontier does not exist; for him love of country, as such, is no nobler sentiment than love of class. The blustering 'patriot,' big with England's glory, is precisely on a level with the bloated plutocrat, proud to belong to that great 'middle class,' which he assures you is 'the backbone of the nation.' Race-pride and class-pride are, from the standpoint of Socialism, involved in the same condemnation. *The establishment of Socialism, therefore, on any national or race basis is out of the question. No, the foreign policy of the great international Socialist Party must be to break up these hideous race monopolies called Empires*, beginning in each case at home. Hence everything which makes for the disruption and disintegration of the empire to which he belongs must be welcomed by the Socialist as an ally."[1]

Again, writes another English Socialist, Mr. C. H. Norman, in a pamphlet entitled *Empire and Murder:*

[1] *The Religion of Socialism*, p. 126.

"Of the many obstacles to the spread of Socialism, there is none more difficult to surmount, perhaps, than the strange idea that an Empire is essential to a nation's welfare or success." [1]

"Socialism," have written two of the leading Socialists in this country, in what is to-day one of the standard English pamphlets on Socialism, "is essentially international. It recognises no distinction between the various nations comprising the modern civilised world. 'My country, right or wrong,' the expression of modern patriotism, is the very antithesis of Socialism. . . . This internationalism means liberty and equality between nations as between individuals, and amalgamation as soon as feasible and as close as possible under the Red Flag of Social Democracy, which does not recognise national distinctions or the division of progressive humanity into nations and races. . . . Socialists are in this respect eminently 'Little Englanders,' 'Little Francers,' and 'Little Germaners.'" [2]

In short, Socialists "are the foes of what generally passes for patriotism, and of all forms of imperialism." [3]

The anti-patriotic character of Socialism is equally pronounced among continental Socialists.

Speaking on September 12, 1907, the French Socialist leader, M. Hervé, thus summarised the sentiments of the French Socialists in this respect:

[1] *Empire and Murder* (published by the Twentieth Century Press), p. 3.

[2] *A New Catechism of Socialism*. By Mr. E. Belfort Bax and Mr. H. Quelch. (The Twentieth Century Press.) 1906. Pages 31 and 32.

[3] *The Social Democratic Federation: Its Objects, its Principles, and its Work*. Written for the Social Democratic Federation by H. Quelch. (The Twentieth Century Press.) 1905. P. 13.

"As for us, we maintain our position. *We detest all mother-countries. We will not give an inch of our skin for our own,* and if we have to risk our lives it must be for something worth while, and that is to make a revolution."[1]

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald on Socialism and Imperialism

A recent attempt on the part of so able a British Socialist as Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, M.P., to prove that Socialism and Imperialism are not antagonistic, and are not mutually destructive, merits, on account of the writer's importance, some examination in this connection. The work here referred to is entitled *Labour and the Empire,* and was only published in 1907.

In his Introduction the writer has, at the outset, to make the following significant admission: "I am, perhaps, too bold in associating the Labour Party with this book. The Labour Party has, as yet, sanctioned no Imperial policy. . . ."[2]

As the work purports to treat of Socialism, it is clear that the Labour Party must be taken to mean the Socialist Party in the House of Commons.

The opinions expressed in the work cannot, therefore, be construed as representing the opinions of other Socialist M.P.'s besides that of the author.

So far, however, as the author's personal opinions are concerned, it may reasonably be doubted from passages in this very volume whether Mr. Macdonald's views on Imperialism and on the inherent international character of Socialism in many respects

[1] See the *Times*, September 14, 1907.
[2] *Labour and the Empire*, pp. xiii. and xiv.

do differ widely, if at all, from those of accepted Socialism.

The writer himself speaks of "the internationalism of its" (the Labour Party's) "nature."[1] Of "the frowning fortresses of aggressive nationalism."[2] Of "the characteristic spirit of internationalism" in reference to "Labour Parties."[3] And of "the spirit which has been misled and exploited by the Imperialist movement."[4]

Further, Mr. Macdonald asserts that "Empire and Imperialism are expressions which must be obnoxious to any democratic party, because they imply a conception of national destiny and a method of government distasteful to the democratic spirit."[5]

Whatever may, however, be the precise nature of Mr. Macdonald's own views on this important subject, his work in no way impugns the justness of the conclusion that Socialism and Imperialism are opposing, and not kindred, forces; and that the success of either entails the necessary defeat of the other.

Consequently Mr. Macdonald's conundrum, "Is it" (the British Empire) "to melt as empires have melted away before?"[6] may safely be answered in the affirmative, if Socialism is to be the governing power in this country.

Patriotism a Barrier to Socialism

Socialists in every country recognise the need for undermining, so far as possible, that formidable barrier to universal Socialism, patriotism.

[1] *Labour and the Empire*, p. 108.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 109.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 110.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 14.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 35.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 33.

"To adopt collectivism," writes M. Émile Faguet, "before cosmopolitanism be realised, is to place the cart before the oxen . . . so long as this idea of fatherland exercises sway over the minds of men, Socialism will be unable to make sufficient progress." [1]

The sentiment of patriotism of itself, as M. Faguet proceeds to point out, directly conflicts with the Socialist doctrine of Equality, in that the former necessitates the existence of a defensive force. This again requires the continued existence of different ranks. Hence Equality, for its adoption, renders necessary the sacrifice of the sentiment of patriotism.[2]

"Chauvinistic nationalism," asserts Mr. Belfort Bax, "is the political side of the *status quo* of which capitalism is the corner-stone." [3]

So far do the doctrines of Socialism in principle extend, that were England under a non-Socialist form of government to be invaded by a hostile Socialist State, it would at once become the duty of the English Socialist to assist the foreign invader against his own fellow-countrymen.

Mr. Belfort Bax thus explicitly expounds what is the duty of the English Socialist: " . . . Supposing Social Democracy triumphant in Germany before other Western countries were ripe for the change of their own initiative. It might then be a matter of life and death for Socialist Germany to forestall a military and economic isolation in the face of a reactionary European coalition by immediate action, especially against the stronghold of modern

[1] *Le Socialisme en* 1907, pp. 254, 255.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 256.
[3] *The Ethics of Socialism*, p. 41.

commercialism. Should such an invasion of the country take place, it would be the duty of every Socialist to do all in his power to assist the invaders to crush the will of the count-of-heads majority of the people of England, knowing that the real welfare of the latter lay therein, little as they might suspect it."[1]

The Socialist's "Justification"

Some reference has already been made in this chapter to the ground on which Socialists were at the outset accustomed to justify the anti-national position taken up by them, namely, that "the workman has no country." This alleged justification, since the date when it was first coined, has lost much, if not all, of what little foundation it then possessed.

So long as the proletariat were excluded from political rights, the Socialist contention took the form that as the proletariat were prevented from being citizens, they could *not*, as a consequence, be expected to possess the feelings and sentiments of citizens. Now that this grievance has in most civilised countries been rectified, and not a few countries have granted *universal* suffrage, Socialism still remains as anti-national as before. In fact, the anti-national character of Socialism is to-day even more strongly pronounced. In justification of their present position, Socialists now allege their exclusion from a share in property which they claim of right to be theirs. As this contention, as interpreted by the Socialist, extends to *all* privately owned property of

[1] *The Ethics of Socialism*, p. 128.

any value whatsoever, such an excuse is unlikely to desert them under a non-Socialistic form of government.

Socialism and the Monarchy

"The following," states Mr. H. Quelch, "is a summarised programme of the S.D.F." (*i.e.* Social Democratic Federation).

"Immediate Reforms.
Political.
Abolition of the Monarchy."[1]

"Socialists," write Mr. Belfort Bax and Mr. Quelch, two of the leading Socialists in England, "are essentially thorough-going Republicans. Socialism, which aims at political and economic equality, is radically inconsistent with any other political form whatever than that of Republicanism. . . . Monarchy and Socialism, or Empire and Socialism, are incompatible and inconceivable. Socialism involves political and economic equality, while Monarchy or Empire essentially imply domination and inequality."[2]

In the face of such explicit statements as the foregoing, in regard to the immediate abolition of the Monarchy in this country, if ever Socialists come to acquire a majority, it is extraordinary how many persons in this country, including even Members of Parliament, are ignorant of the fact that this proposal occupies a prominent position in the Socialist gospel.

[1] *The Social Democratic Federation: Its Objects, its Principles, and its Work.* Written for the Social Democratic Federation by H. Quelch. (The Twentieth Century Press), 1905, p. 14.

[2] *A New Catechism of Socialism.* (The Twentieth Century Press), 1906, p. 33.

Doubtless, English Socialists themselves have, for tactical reasons, done much to foster this ignorance. The British Socialist writer and speaker habitually chooses his topics carefully, and adapts his language to suit his audience. Accordingly, Socialists have not infrequently sought to cloak the fact that the abolition of the Monarchy forms a prominent part of their programme, and, indeed, a primary essential of Socialism.

At a public debate which took place in Hammersmith on November 22, 1907, on the subject of Socialism, between Sir William Bull, M.P., and Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., the latter, in reply to the plain question from Sir William Bull, "Are you in favour of the abolition of the Monarchy and the dethronement of King Edward?" was sufficiently disingenuous to state, "In theory I am a Republican. But I attach so little importance to it that I would not lift my little finger to abolish the Monarchy."[1]

Despite the progress in Socialism which is to-day taking place in Great Britain, we still believe that with the vast majority of British audiences arguments in favour of the maintenance of the Monarchy are superfluous. The programme of Socialism in regard to this subject has, it is submitted, only to be clearly placed before the people of this country to receive an emphatic rejection. It is none the less important, however, that ignorance as to what are the Socialist proposals should in this, as in every other connection, be actively dissipated. To the greatly exaggerated arguments used by Socialists as

[1] See *The Daily Express*, November 23, 1907.

to the saving in cost which would accrue from the abolition of the Monarchy in the case of the United Kingdom, some reference should here be made.

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the total cost of maintaining the British Monarchy amounts to one million pounds a year, which is the highest figure at which its opponents as a rule venture to place it, this divided amongst the present total population of the United Kingdom amounts to very considerably less than 6*d. per head* per annum. "It costs, therefore," as Mr. W. H. Mallock has fittingly said, "each individual less to maintain," than to drink the King's health "in a couple of pots of porter."[1]

If the continued existence of the Monarchy be considered from no higher or more ennobling standpoint than that of pounds, shillings and pence, the benefits which directly accrue to trade, and therefore indirectly to the vast bulk of the population, when contrasted with a Republican form of government, such as, for example, to-day exists in France, are on examination readily recognisable.

The existence of the Monarchy in addition exercises a very considerable effect on the number of foreigners who annually visit this country, and leave behind them very large sums of money, disbursed during their stay. It has an equally important bearing on the vast sums annually contributed to charitable purposes, &c. Whilst, still more important, the Monarchy constitutes in the case of the present world-wide British Empire a strong, ever-present personal *nexus*, and is thus intimately inter-connected with the vastly added strength and with the enormous trade

[1] *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, p. 47.

benefits which accrue to each and every part of the Empire from the existing Union.

In addition to, and far exceeding, such subsidiary reasons as these, far-reaching in their results though they undoubtedly are, the strongest reason of all why the nation at large favours, in this country, the maintenance of a Constitutional Monarchy, lies in the fact that its roots are deeply entwined in the hearts of most of the people, and never more so than at the present time.

This portion of the Socialist programme, therefore, of itself constitutes a most powerful and forcible reason why Socialism should be resolutely opposed throughout the United Kingdom. As Empire and Socialism are mutually inimical, so also are Socialism and Loyalty. The abolition of the Monarchy is a necessary sequence if Socialism should triumph.

V

THE SOCIALIST STATE

An Analysis and Criticism

The magnitude of the claim which Socialism puts forward is sufficiently demonstrated by the following quotations taken from the writings of leading Socialists in this country.

Mr. Robert Blatchford, the well-known editor of the Socialist *Clarion*, in a recent pamphlet writes: ". . . We must turn to Socialism, the only remedy, the only hope."[1]

Mr. H. M. Hyndman, the leading spirit of the Social Democratic Federation of Great Britain, puts forward much the same claim: "But all that reasonable human beings can desire for themselves and their offspring can be obtained by moderate service for the community through Social Democracy, *and Social Democracy alone*."[2]

"For the workers Socialism is the only way," states Mr. F. Victor Fisher,[3] another English Socialist writer.

[1] *What is this Socialism?* By Robert Blatchford. Issued by the *Clarion* Scouts. P. 12.

[2] *Social Democracy.* (Reprint of a Lecture delivered at the Queen's Hall, London, April 14, 1904.) P. 22.

[3] *The Babies' Tribute to the Modern Moloch* (Twentieth Century Press), p. 16.

The foregoing Socialist statements may be taken to be fairly typical of the claim made on behalf of Socialism by its adherents. They indicate also that the absence of self-confidence is *not* an inherent characteristic of the supporters of Socialism.

Socialism is for all the world a quack medicine, and should be under suspicion in consequence. There is no evil which Socialism will not cure—so we are told. It is the moral, political, social, and industrial panacea.

Naturally, then, the necessarily limited proposals of practical social reform compare at a disadvantage with the offerings of theoretical Socialism ; and the adherents of Socialism are largely composed of those who prefer two Socialist proposals in the bush to one social reform in the hand.

The temptation to clutch at the delusive as offering a more speedy remedy than true reform is at all times strong. Hence the popularity of Socialism.

Socialists, in regard to both Past and Present, may be described as ultra-pessimists ; and in regard to the future as unbounded optimists.

"If the world is not only bad to-day, but must be so for ever, . . . then no one can regard the Socialist scheme of reformation as anything but a swindle." [1]

Even Mr. Hyndman, in a lecture delivered at the Queen's Hall, London (April 14, 1904), made use of the following statement: "But it is no use to criticise both these Parties" (*i.e.* "Tory" and "Liberal"), "and to proclaim where they are wrong, unless we

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, by Dr. Schäffle. Translated by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, p. 34.

are prepared to propound something ourselves ; and unless, further, we are able to say that not only have we a theory as regards the past and a policy as regards the present, but a distinct intention of putting forward measures which will carry us through the future." [1]

If the majority of those who bow the knee to Socialism accept it merely on the faith of Socialist statements as to its healing powers, *without* in any way first troubling to analyse these assertions, it becomes all the more necessary for others to ascertain what is the real nature of the *constructive* policy of Socialism.

The professors of Socialism, caustically remarks M. Faguet in his recent book, are entirely in accord at the present time as to what it is necessary to destroy, but are disagreed as to what should be substituted in its place.[2]

Not only is this to-day actually the case, but there is grave reason for doubting whether Socialists have given any serious thought at all to the complex subject of a constructive policy.

"The question is how can Socialism be accomplished?" writes Mr. Robert Blatchford, whose writings have played so leading a part in promoting the growth of English Socialism.

"I confess that I approach this question with great reluctance. The establishment and organisation of a Socialistic State are the two branches of the work to which I have given least attention."

Mr. Blatchford next proceeds to assure all whom

[1] *Social Democracy* (Twentieth Century Press), p. 2.
[2] See *Le Socialisme en* 1907, p. 76.

he has sought to persuade to uproot entirely the present complex economic and industrial system, that so far as concerns a *constructive* policy ". . . I will do my best, merely observing that I can lay claim to no special knowledge, nor to any special aptitude for such a task."[1]

Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P., the present leader of the Independent Labour Party, himself affords another striking instance of how little time and study Socialists have given to a constructive policy, as opposed to merely destructive criticism.

In his recent publication *From Serfdom to Socialism*, Mr. Keir Hardie spends upwards of 100 pages in condemning and denouncing the existing social system, and then briefly states: "To dogmatise about the form which the Socialist State shall take is to play the fool. That is a matter with which we have nothing whatever to do. It belongs to the future, and is a matter which posterity alone can decide. The most we can hope to do is to make the coming of Socialism possible *in the full assurance that it will shape itself aright when it does come. . . . As for progress and development under Socialism, these may be safely left to care for themselves.*"[2] (The italics are our own.)

Nor in thus brusquely seeking to dispose of the question of a *constructive* policy does Mr. Keir Hardie among Socialists by any means stand alone.

"It would be absurd and contrary to Socialist principles," states the American Socialist writer, Mr. Spargo, "to attempt to give detailed specifications of the Socialist State."[3]

[1] *Merrie England*, p. 104. [2] Pages 96, 97.
[3] *Socialism*, by John Spargo, p. 211, published 1906.

"Socialists do not profess to be architects. They have not planned the future in minute detail," declares another Socialist author of importance, Mr. Laurence Gronlund.[1]

". . . Socialists to-day," so a leading Socialist, Mr. W. D. P. Bliss, assures us, "spend little time in dreaming of the future. *To the future the future may be left.*"[2]

Further, writes the same author, "No one can portray Socialism any more than Radicalism, because Socialism is a principle, *not* a scheme."[3]

To this latter assertion on the part of Mr. Bliss, our reply is briefly that Socialism purports to be very much of a scheme, in that it seeks to uproot entirely the whole industrial and economic system which to-day prevails in civilised countries, and also to very materially repeal and alter the moral code.

Dr. Schäffle thus sums up the situation, which has in no way changed since these words were written: ". . . On the minutiæ of its world-transforming Social Organisation, even on the means and methods of the transition, Social Democracy has not yet definitely pronounced. I suspect that this reticence proceeds not only from reasons of policy, but *also from the absence of any detailed programme worked out and raised to the dignity of a party creed.*"[4]

Such a criticism has been endorsed even by Socialists themselves.

For example, the well-known English Socialist,

[1] *The Co-operative Commonwealth*, p. 126.
[2] *Handbook of Socialism*, p. 25.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 197.
[4] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy.* Translated by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, pp. 8 and 9.

Mr. H. G. Wells, in an article in *The Fortnightly Review* for November 1906, states: "I don't believe that the Socialist idea is as yet nearly enough thought out and elaborated for very much of it to be realised of set intention now. . . . Socialism is the still incomplete, the still sketchy and sketchily indicative plan of a new life for the world."

Mrs. Sidney Webb, the wife of the eminent English Socialist, who is herself a distinguished adherent of Socialism, in a lecture on "The Faith I Hold," addressed to a private meeting of the Fabian Society held in London, is thus reported in the *Fabian News* of November 1907:—

"We fail to convince at present largely because, though we have feeling, *we do not know enough about the facts and processes of life and government.* Our science is still insufficient."

Denunciation, in a word, constitutes the Socialist forte. Comparisons between the lot of the rich and poor, as Mr. Edmund Vincent has well said, are the weapons with which the agitator fights. "At ordinary times the ashes of this jealous discontent do but smoulder; but they are always there, and the agitator with his windy speech blows them to a white heat."[1]

With abundant reason, therefore, writes Mr. C. H. Norman, a prominent English Socialist, ". . . the strength of the Socialist case lies in the fact that its efficacy has *not* been tested."[2]

And may we not add to Mr. Norman's words,

[1] "The Discontent of the Working Classes," by Mr. Edmund Vincent. Published in *A Plea for Liberty*, p. 210.

[2] *Empire and Murder* (published by the Twentieth Century Press), p. 3.

"because it has carefully refrained from unfolding its policy, or from outlining anything approaching a detailed constructive policy."

"I am an Ideal Socialist," writes Mr. Blatchford, "and desire to have the whole Socialistic programme carried out." [1]

What, then, is Ideal Socialism?

The same author thus proceeds to define it.[2] "Under Ideal Socialism there would be no money at all and no wages. The industry of the country would be organised and managed by the State, much as the post-office now is; goods of all kinds would be produced and distributed for use and not for sale, in such quantities as were needed; hours of labour would be fixed, and every citizen would take what he or she desired from the common stock. Food, clothing, lodging, fuel, transit, amusements, and all other things would be absolutely free, and the only difference between a Prime Minister and a collier would be the difference of rank and occupation."

To this brief description by Mr. Blatchford, we may reply in the words of Mr. Stanley Robertson, that "Society is not an army which can be fed on rations, clothed in a uniform, and lodged in barracks. Even if it were, the task would be too much for Government departments, which habitually fail, or commit shortcomings in dealing with the special classes which they do undertake to feed, clothe, and lodge." [3]

In referring to the Socialist State Mr. Belfort Bax, a prominent member of the English Social Democratic Federation, informs his readers, ". . . the life

[1] *Merrie England*, p. 100. [2] P. 103.
[3] *A Plea for Liberty*, Mr. Stanley Robertson, p. 58.

of the future will be international, cosmopolitan, in its scope." [1]

This statement merely emphasises the anti-national side of Socialism (as to which see chapter iv.), and throws no further light on the constructive policy of Socialism.

Mr. Hyndman in the following declaration merely repeats the usual vague Socialist generality: "We intend to do away with Government control by the dominant classes, and we want to replace it with an organised co-operative industry for the benefit of the whole community, under the control of the whole people." [2]

In referring to the Utopias which Socialists have themselves constructed, Mr. John Spargo, the Socialist writer, observes: "Most intelligent Socialists, if called upon to choose between them, would probably prefer to live in Thibet under a personal despotism rather than under the rule of the hierarchies of some of these imaginary commonwealths which Utopian Socialists have depicted." [3]

Excepting only the idlest of Utopias, to which Mr. Spargo refers in the preceding quotation, Socialists have themselves personally refrained from propounding anything approaching to a detailed constructive policy.

For this purpose, consequently, recourse must still be had mainly to the writings of Dr. Schäffle.

In *The Quintessence of Socialism* Dr. Schäffle has ably welded together the principal characteristics

[1] *The Religion of Socialism*, p. 52.
[2] *Social Democracy* (Reprint of a Lecture delivered at Queen's Hall, London, April 14, 1904), p. 22.
[3] *Socialism*, by John Spargo, p. 213.

likely to be encountered in the Socialist State. This the writer has succeeded in doing as the result of a detailed and prolonged study of Socialism as portrayed by its leading international adherents. Socialists have themselves testified to the impartiality and ability with which Dr. Schäffle has performed this complex task.

"Schäffle," writes Mr. Thomas Kirkup, "in his *Quintessenz des Socialismus*, appears as the interpreter of the Marx Socialism." [1]

According again to Mr. Kirkup, Dr. Schäffle "has brought to the study of social problems a combination of learning, of philosophic insight directed by the best light of his time, and of sympathy inspired by the cause of the poor man, which is not equalled by any living economist." [2]

Mr. W. D. P. Bliss, a leading American Socialist, in his *Handbook of Socialism*, refers to Dr. Schäffle's *Quintessence* as "a book which, though somewhat critical, is perhaps the fairest statement of Socialism by one not a Socialist." [3]

"He"—Dr. Schäffle—"has written of Socialism so fairly in many ways in his *Quintessence of Socialism*, that many have called him its defender . . ." adds Mr. Bliss.[4]

Having regard, therefore, to the important part which Dr. Schäffle's writings play in the study of Socialism, it may be well to state here that not only does Dr. Schäffle rank among the most eminent of political economists, but that at one period he

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 279.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 339.
[3] P. 176.
[4] *Handbook of Socialism*, p. 255.

occupied the important post of Minister of Finance in Austria.

Author of several notable works, he was at one time also professor in Vienna. His chief writings include *Bau und Leben des sozialen Körpers*, *Die Quintessenz*, and *Die Aussichtlosigkeit der Sozial Demokratie*. These two latter publications have both been translated into English by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, under the respective titles of *The Quintessence of Socialism* and *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*.

So leading an authority on Socialism as M. Émile de Laveleye refers to the *Quintessence* as the only publication which explains the scheme of Collectivism and treats it "in a scientific way."[1]

Whilst the work of Marx and his coadjutors was merely critical and destructive, "Schäffle," states Professor Flint, "undertook the task which they had not ventured on, and made Collectivism look as plausible as possible. He presented the case for it so skilfully indeed, that all those who have since attempted to show its practicability have done little else than substantially repeat what he had said."[2]

Principal Features of the Socialist State

Amongst the principal features of the Socialist or Collectivist State would, accordingly, be included the following:—

"The productive labour of all would be associated in establishments for the purposes of production

[1] *Socialism of To-day*, English translation, p. 260.
[2] *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, pp. 254 and 255.

and exchange, socially managed, equipped out of Collective capital and worked by persons in receipt of salaries. . . ." [1]

"The amount of supply necessary in each form of production would be fixed by continuous official returns. . . ." [2]

At present, demand determines production. In the Socialist State demand will be restricted by production.

"The individual," as Mr. R. J. Bryce well states, "would no more work, as it were, for his own hand; he would be only an atom in the great cosmos of labour." [3]

If we refer again to the writings of Dr. Schäffle, ". . . The Alpha and Omega of Socialism is the transformation of private and competing capitals into a united Collective capital." [4]

Mr. Thomas Kirkup entirely corroborates the above statement of Dr. Schäffle by declaring, ". . . the economic basis of the prevalent Socialism is a Collectivism which excludes private possession of land and capital, and places them under social ownership in some form or other." [5]

Socialism "does not ignore capital as an economic factor," [6] but only declines to recognise the *private* ownership of capital.

This distinction is of the first importance, as Socialist speakers too often attempt to induce their

[1] *Quintessence of Socialism.* Translated by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, p. 5.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[3] *State Socialism*, p. 13.
[4] *Quintessence of Socialism*, p. 20.
[5] *History of Socialism*, p. 12. 1906 edition.
[6] *Quintessence of Socialism*, p. 36.

audiences to believe that under Socialism labour will receive the *whole* fruits of both labour and of capital.

"The Socialists," writes Mr. W. H. Lever, M.P., in a recently published article, "propose to nationalise all the implements of production, and to make the State the owner of all capital, and, therefore, the one and only employer. But by nationalising the implements of production, they will *not* have abolished capital; *they will have altered the nominal ownership of capital, but they cannot abolish capital,* and for this reason —that capital is essential to production."[1]

The programme of Collectivism is "very different from a periodical redistribution of private property. It implies Collective ownership of the means of production. . . ."[2]

As to the method of distribution, there can be little doubt, it may be confidently submitted, that the formula which Socialism would be forced to accept is that which Mr. Keir Hardie here sets forth: "For free Communism," "the rule of life will be—From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."[3]

Everything (as shown on p. 232) points to the conclusion that Socialism, *unless* it is to abandon some of its primary principles, will be compelled to adopt this principle. The foregoing formula, it will be noted, applies both to production and to distribution, and traces its origin from Louis Blanc.

The principle embodied in this formula is usually styled "Proportional Collectivism," and received

[1] *The Magazine of Commerce*, October 1907, p. 77.
[2] *Quintessence of Socialism*, p. 30.
[3] *From Serfdom to Socialism*, p. 89.

official recognition at the celebrated Gotha Socialist Congress of 1875.

Dr. Schäffle thus briefly explains its meaning: " . . . To each equal labour, according to his capacity to labour for the whole, but enjoyment of commodities to each, according to his reasonable needs out of the Collective treasury of the whole." [1]

In the Collectivist Commonwealth, as Professor Graham points out, "there would be no law of value except what it pleased the rulers to lay down on some imaginary principle or on none at all." [2]

As supply and demand would no longer constitute the governing factor in production, State storage would be necessary to maintain the balance between production and consumption. This would consequently have to be adopted on a vast scale.

A system of public payment would, under Socialism, be "*the sole form of income.*" [3]

Coinage will eventually cease, and certificates of labour take its place.[4]

In referring to the abolition of payment by money in the Socialist State, Dr. Schäffle writes: "It would only be in business relations with capitalistic States, or with capitalistic survivals inside the national *régime*, that the balance on the value of imports and exports and of internal barter would have to be adjusted by money." [5]

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, p. 55. Translated by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet.
[2] *Socialism, New and Old*, p. 198.
[3] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, by Dr. Schäffle. Translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 11.
[4] *Quintessence of Socialism*, p. 69. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

"The abolition of money," writes Mr. Stanley Robertson, "is not necessarily part of the scheme of Collective production. It has been 'tacked on' to Collective production because Socialists have taken up the idea that money is conducive to free capitalism, as it undoubtedly is." As the same writer further proceeds to point out, the Socialist State would want money in so far as it had dealings with non-Socialist States.

Whilst, further, if all the world were to adopt Socialism, it does not follow that they would adopt it on precisely the same terms.[1]

It should be noted here that Socialists are not unanimous regarding the need for dispensing with the use of money under Socialism.

Karl Kautsky, by many Socialists regarded as one of the great leaders of this period, accepts unreservedly the doctrine that wages unequal and paid in money will be the accepted method of reward for labour under Socialism.

Notwithstanding the authority with which Kautsky speaks on this subject, we venture unhesitatingly to doubt the possibility of effect being given to either of these two suggestions.

As shown in chapter vii. (p. 226 *et seq.*), wages, if they differed in amount to any considerable extent, would lead practically to a revival of existing differences. They would, in a word, re-introduce capitalism. The boasted equality of condition which Socialism purports to confer would again, in this case, be relegated to the Greek Kalends.

[1] "The Impracticability of Socialism." Published in *A Plea for Liberty*, p. 43.

As regards the second point, money by nature conduces, as stated above by Mr. Stanley Robertson, too much in the direction of capitalism for its use to receive the sanction of a Socialist majority. The greater portion of the adherents of Socialism will never voluntarily accede to thus imperilling their favourite principle "Equality"; a principle which with them is identical with envy, and is rooted in "the evil eye and grudging heart which cannot bear to contemplate the good of others." [1]

Another salient feature of Socialism is the extent to which man, instead of as hitherto depending on himself, is to depend, *and, if necessary, to be made to depend*, upon the State. The preponderating part which the State is to play represents one of the fundamental principles on which is based the Socialist *régime*. The all-important duties which under Socialism are to devolve upon the State strike the observer at every turn. Another striking feature of the Socialist State consists in the extent to which the individual's power of choice is to be restricted.

"Socialism forbids the future use of property as private means of production, as a private source of income, and thus necessarily puts an end to all inequalities of income. . . ." [2]

From this it necessarily follows that, even were compensation granted on the introduction of Socialism to those expropriated, *it would only be in the form of consumable goods, and would* NOT *be capable of being converted into a source of income.*

[1] *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, p. 316.
[2] *The Quintessence of Socialism*, p. 34.

"No private capital, and *hence no competition of private capitals*, is any longer to exist. . . ." [1]

". . . The transfer of savings into the future, in the way of interest-bearing credit, would," affirms Dr. Schäffle, "be rigorously excluded." [2]

"Many Socialists," writes Dr. Schäffle, "have promised to the proletariat an almost regal Collective luxury . . .; but would leave them next to no freedom in their private households, or in their individual tastes and requirements—next to no room for free family life and comfortable homes." [3]

By Mr. Blatchford we are introduced under Socialism to a life spent almost wholly in public. ". . . We set up one great kitchen, one general dining-hall, and one pleasant tea-garden." [4]

In *Industry under Socialism* we are treated by Mrs. Annie Besant to a picture of "public meal-rooms," "large dwellings" which are to replace "old-fashioned cottages"; [5] in fact, to all the paraphernalia of the barracks.

The Socialist State, thus garbed, would be merely a glorified "work-house." The only material difference would be that work would be a stern reality, in place of the "light manual labour which permits the hospice to retain the name of house of work," as an Italian journal recently wrote of the English work-house. Even then it is more than doubtful that the Socialist State (see chapter vi.) will be able to equal the provision afforded by the Poplar Work-house in the halcyon days of Socialist management,

[1] *The Quintessence of Socialism*, p. 45.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 114.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 41, 42.
[4] *Merrie England*, p. 49; and see pp. 44, 48.
[5] *Fabian Essays*, p. 155.

with its daily allowance, sometimes exceeding 200 pints of beer, and tea at 2s. 4d. per pound.[1]

Dr. Schäffle draws attention to the important fact that "It would no doubt be in the power of the State to check entirely all demand for what seemed injurious by simply not producing it."[2]

As to what is to be the power of the individual, in regard to using what he receives, is one of the many points on which Socialism has as yet no definite policy. "This one practical fundamental right of the individual to spend his private income according to his own choice," declares Dr. Schäffle, "is not to be sold for all possible advantages of social reform. . . ."[3]

The State under Socialism would naturally be charged with the collection, warehousing, and transporting of all products. Such as remained after the necessary deductions on capital account, State maintenance, &c., &c., would finally be divided among the community in the manner already described, namely, according to individual needs *as construed by the State*, that is, by the State officials.

"Out of the value of the communal produce must come," writes Mrs. Annie Besant in *Industry under Socialism*, "rent of land payable to the local authority, rent of plant needed for working the industries, wages advanced and fixed in the usual way, taxes, reserve fund, accumulation fund, and the other charges necessary for the carrying on of the communal business. *All these deducted*, the remaining

[1] See pp. 15 and 29 of the Report on the Poplar Union (Cd. 3240 of 1906).

[2] *The Quintessence of Socialism*, p. 44.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

value should be divided among the communal workers as a 'bonus.'" [1]

Socialism, as previously observed, involves the State management and control of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange. So gigantic is this task that it is difficult for the human mind to fully conceive all that this would entail.

"Socialism, as at present formulated," writes Dr. Schäffle, "has absolutely not attempted to establish by what means it intends to bring such an enormous mass of Collective labour and Collective capital in all its minutiæ to the pitch of profitable individual work." [2]

"Socialism," further writes Dr. Schäffle, "will entirely put an end to national debts, private debts, tenancy, leases, and all stocks and shares negotiable on the Bourse." [3]

This, in itself, constitutes a revolution of existing conditions.

"Shares, stocks, partnerships, superior rents, mortgages, private loans, agricultural rent, and house rent," will one and all disappear.[4]

"Private wages, speculative separate capital (private and belonging to companies), competition, market and exchange, market price and exchange price, commerce fostered by advertising, . . . the splendid arrangements for display of wares, use of coinage, credit, hire and lease, as well as all the present forms of private income (wages, profit, interest, ground and house rents), the derivation of public income

[1] *Fabian Essays*, p. 163.
[2] *The Quintessence of Socialism*, p. 56.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 64.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

from private income (that is to say, existing taxation)," [1] all these, again, emphatically states Dr. Schäffle, would cease to exist under Socialism.

". . . The demand for public purposes would be drawn straight from the public stores. . . ." [2]

All that the State might require for its own support would either have to be obtained in the above manner by a deduction from the gross production or by a tax in kind. Having regard to the all-pervading action of the State under Socialism, and to the abnormal number of officials of every kind which such a *régime* must necessitate, everything points unmistakably to the conclusion that the Socialist State would require a vastly increased expenditure.

As Mr. W. H. Lever, M.P., has recently stated: ". . . Under the new conditions the employer, that is, the State, would be represented by managers, who would have to be paid fixed salaries. . . . Whereas formerly the employer took for remuneration only the leavings (if any) of capital and labour, the employer would now take, as managers representing the State, a fixed salary to be added to the cost of production." [3]

"Social labour-time," observes Dr. Schäffle, "forms theoretically in the strictest sense the basis of Socialism." [4]

In this connection it is important to note that "the reduction of skilled labour to unskilled," necessitated by the Marxian theory of value, could, as Professor Graham enforces, only be *arbitrarily*

[1] *The Quintessence of Socialism*, p. 97. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 99.
[3] *The Magazine of Commerce*, October 1907, p. 77.
[4] *The Quintessence of Socialism*, p. 81.

assumed, as no other possible method of calculation exists.[1]

"Those who yielded services of general utility, as judges, administrative officials," &c., "*i.e.* all *not* immediately productive workers . . . would receive a share in the commodities produced by the national labour, proportioned to the time spent by them in work useful to the community." [2]

Such would, therefore, necessitate a further substantial deduction from the gross total product.

As to whether Socialism would in practice permit of private property in anything, except perhaps what a person carries on his back, is more than doubtful.

Mr. Victor Grayson, at a public meeting in July 1907, held in the Colne Valley Division, in reply to a question from a heckler, "Do you believe in private property?" answered, "I would nationalise the means of production, but a man would keep his toothbrush and toothpick." [3]

No doubt this answer must not be taken too literally, but there is good reason for believing that it closely approximates to what Socialism would, in practice, permit of.

At all events we learn from the *Fabian Essays*, in the article on "Property under Socialism," that "If we wish all Raphael's pictures to be freely accessible to every one, *we must prevent men* not merely from exhibiting them for payment but *from owning them.*" [4]

[1] *Socialism, New and Old*, p. 198.
[2] *The Quintessence of Socialism*, pp. 8 and 9.
[3] *The Morning Post*, July 17, 1907.
[4] "Property under Socialism," by Mr. Graham Wallas, p. 139. Published in the *Fabian Essays*.

This line of reasoning effectually prohibits the private ownership of anything of appreciable value.

Mr. Graham Wallas himself proceeds to extend the principle to such articles as a "printing press," "a plough," and "a set of bookbinders' tools." [1]

It becomes, therefore, for all practical purposes a matter of very small significance as to whether Socialism proposes to totally abolish the right of inheritance or to recognise it; since, even in the latter event, it will be still strictly limited to objects of comparatively small value.

The following conclusion of Dr. Schäffle is deserving of the most careful attention: ". . . As soon as you put a premium on economical merit, take into consideration the use-value of the contributions of work and of the produce, keep in view the assurance of a firm authoritative guidance of the immense business of Collective production—as soon as you do this, you have scattered to the winds the spirit of democracy; nothing more can then be said about the equal share of every individual in the control, or about a division of the produce of social labour which shall be equally just to all, or even equal throughout. *Socialism has then no further charm for the masses.*" [2]

State Socialism *v.* Collectivism

The fact that a very limited measure of State management of the means of distribution and production has, in a few instances, under the present system succeeded, in no way justifies the contention

[1] *Fabian Essays*, p. 139.
[2] *The Quintessence of Socialism*, pp. 123, 124.

that similar success will also attend the Socialist State.

To-day high salaries capable of securing the exercise of ability are paid to managers and to superintendents. In the Socialist State the principle of Equality (as shown in chapter vii. p. 226 *et seq.*) would constitute an insurmountable barrier to the payment of any such salaries. All must receive, at all events approximately, the same. Socialism, therefore, in order to justify the probability of success, has first to postulate that ability will give its best services *without* the stimulus of any real incentive.

That this is *not* the case all past experience goes conclusively to prove.

The Lessons Taught by Communistic Societies

The fact, also, that certain Communistic societies have in the past attained considerable success in no way goes to show that a Socialist State would succeed.

In the former case Communism has been *voluntarily* adopted by the various members of the community. In the latter case *compulsion* alone would, in a large number of instances, bring about the adoption of Communism, or, to speak with more precision, Collectivism.

Further, in those societies which in the past have attained any degree of success, religious influences have invariably played a leading part, and asceticism has been the rule of life.

"Mr. Noyes," writes Mr. Rae, "gives us an account of forty-seven Communistic experiments which had

been made under modern Socialist influences in the United States and had failed ; while Mr. Nordhoff, on the other hand, furnishes a like account of seventy-two communities, established mainly under religious influences (fifty-eight of them belonging to the Shakers alone) which have been not merely social but economic successes. . . ."[1]

The Shaker communities, as Mr. Nordhoff records in his valuable account of them, speedily make it too uncomfortable for the indolent to remain. If such methods fail in the desired result, the community possesses in all cases the right of expulsion.

Professor Flint has thus summarised the lessons which may be deduced from these experiments : ". . . Wherever Communistic associations have not proved failures as industrial or economical experiments, their success has been dependent on two conditions—namely, a small membership and a strict discipline ; the one of which proves that Communism cannot be applied to nations, and the other of which shows that it is not in harmony with the temper of a democratic age."[2]

One noticeable feature to be met with throughout these Communistic groups is, observes Professor Woolsey, an entire absence on the part of their members of that hatred towards society generally, which is to-day the leading characteristic of Socialists. "They thought only that they had reached a better form of society, yet one which it would not be possible for all men to adopt. . . ."[3]

[1] Mr. Rae's *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 403.
[2] *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, p. 58.
[3] *Communism and Socialism*, by Professor Woolsey, p. 85.

The United States has been the country specially prolific in providing examples of Communistic experiments, as already here indicated. As these are not without their important lessons, so far as concerns the probability of success or failure attending the working of the Socialist State, it may be desirable to refer somewhat further to this subject.

Before, however, attempting to do this, it is important to impress upon the reader the fact to which M. Faguet here directs attention :—

"The Socialist is a person who believes that the Communistic *régime* should be applied to a whole nation, and he is therefore the enemy of those who detach themselves from a nation in order to apply the Communistic system only among themselves."[1]

To revert to the experiences of Communistic societies in America. Of the eleven colonies created either personally by Robert Owen or traceable to his influence, all have miserably failed, and the *average* duration of eight of the principal ones was about one year and a half.[2]

Similarly, of the thirty-four communities founded, in a degree, on the "rule" of Fourier, all had disappeared prior to 1879, and a large number of them lasted only a few months.[3]

" . . . It seems to have been a peculiarity of the Owenite and Fourierist communities," states Mr. Rae in summarising their history, "that the industrious wrought much harder (and, in most of them, for much poorer fare) than labourers of ordinary life."[4]

[1] *Le Socialisme en* 1907, p. 4.
[2] See *Communism and Socialism*, p. 52.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[4] *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 404.

The Rappites and Separatists of Zoar both attained very considerable success. Both, however, were religious communities, and did not exceed a few hundred in numbers. The former community adopted celibacy. In the latter community marriage was tolerated, but to a large extent discouraged.[1]

Such degree of success as has attended Communistic societies in practice will be found, therefore, to extend only to such as have enforced to a large degree asceticism of a very strict nature. What Socialism promises to all is *not*, however, asceticism, but conditions of luxury and ease.

"Now the New Ethic of Socialism," writes Mr. Belfort Bax, "has no part nor lot with asceticism."[2]

Any attempt, consequently, to enforce in the Socialistic State the practice of asceticism will be promptly resisted by those who, owing to these very promises of wealth and ease, have supported the introduction of Socialism. Such resistance will further militate against any possibility of success attending the adoption of Socialism.

The experience of the various Communistic societies in America have time and again proved sloth and indolence to be their chief besetting sin. Active religious incentive was alone able to check, as already shown, the prevalence of this fatal enemy to success. The less industrious sought incessantly to "exploit" the more industrious, with the natural result that these latter found themselves working not only for their own personal support, but also for that of the less industrious and indolent.

[1] See *Communism and Socialism*, by Professor Woolsey, pp. 61–64.
[2] *The Ethics of Socialism*, p. 21.

One of the members of the Brook Farm Socialist Community, Mr. W. H. Channing, thus explained the failure of that undertaking: "The great evil, the radical, practical danger, seemed to be a willingness to do work half thorough, to rest in poor results, to be content amidst comparatively squalid conditions, and to form habits of indolence."[1]

Other members of these various communities have also borne testimony to the disastrous extent to which idleness and indolence have gone to wreck all chances of success.

Mr. Rae emphasises an important lesson bearing on this subject when he states: "The experience of American Communism directly contradicts John Stuart Mill's opinion that men are not more likely to evade their fair share of the work under a Socialistic system than they are now. That difficulty, in one form or another, was their constant vexation."[2]

If the experience of communal life *voluntarily* embarked upon furnishes such adverse results, *à fortiori* these will be intensified in a Socialist State when a large minority will have accepted Collectivist principles, not voluntarily, but only under compulsion. What possible interest will these latter have in striving to promote success for a system to which they are opposed? At most this dissatisfied minority will seek to accomplish merely the requisite *minimum* amount of work.

The various Communistic societies have attempted in the past all that the Socialists now propose,

[1] Frothingham's *W. H. Channing; a Memoir*, p. 218.
[2] *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 404.

omitting only the compulsory appropriation of other people's private property. This is a form of distinction which is certainly unlikely to make for success under Socialism.

Before here dismissing the subject of Socialistic experiments, two other examples, owing to the far greater scale upon which they were tried, deserve consideration.

The Socialist State of Peru

Probably the principal example of a Socialist State was provided by Peru.

"The Incas," for example, states Chambers's *Encyclopædia* (article on Peru), "attempted the administration of a purely Socialistic government. . . ."

From Mr. Herbert Spencer's account[1] in *The Contemporary Review* for September 1881 (vol. xl. pp. 345 and 346) we take the following:—

The whole community was elaborately regimented in groups of various sizes. These were controlled by officers, "and there was an organisation of spies to examine and report upon the doings of the other officers." External and domestic life were both strictly regulated. "The people were required to 'dine and sup with open doors, that the judges might be able to enter freely.' . . ."

The inhabitants were forced to labour for the support of this elaborate State organisation. ". . . The people, completely possessed by the State in person, property, and labour, transplanted to this or that

[1] Quoted in Mr. M. D. O'Brien's *Socialism Tested by Facts*, pp. 88–90.

locality as the Inca directed, and, when not serving in the army, living under a discipline like that within the army, were units in a centralised, regimented machine, moved throughout life, to the greatest practicable extent by the Inca's will and to the least practicable extent by their own wills. . . ."

The consequence was to entirely undermine the character of the entire people. As a result the country in 1531 fell an easy prey to a comparative handful of Spanish adventurers under the command of Pizarro, as portrayed in Prescott's powerful work *The Conquest of Peru.*

In commenting on the case of Peru, Mr. M. D. O'Brien thus effectively replies to the ordinary Socialist rejoinder:—

"It may be said that all this oppression was due to the monarchical form of government that prevailed, and that it could not occur under Social Democracy. . . . Not the vote, but the sphere of the government, determines the degree of the tyranny. If this sphere is wide, there will be oppression, vote as the citizens may. . . . If you could change your masters every day, the masterdom would have to be just as vigorous so long as the sphere of regulation remained undiminished." [1]

It may here be incidentally observed that no form of government is less susceptible of change than is that of a Socialist State. Where everything is directed, managed, and controlled by the State, constant change would utterly shatter the last possibility of the successful working of the State machinery. Such change, if attempted, would

[1] *Socialism Tested by Facts*, pp. 92 and 93.

involve the whole community in a universal and unprecedented cataclysm.

The foregoing conclusion receives express corroboration from Dr. Schäffle, who emphatically regards as primary conditions of successful Socialistic production, "organs of administration and control of business secured from constant danger of overthrow at the hands of the majority of workmen employed."[1]

The French Socialist Experiment of 1848

Among the most memorable instances in modern times of Socialism in practice ranks Louis Blanc's experiment of 1848. This example is, on account of its comparative recency, doubly instructive.

This great Communist was permitted by the French Provisional Government, of which he was himself a member, to found *ateliers nationaux*, or national workshops. This was in fulfilment of the Government's promise to provide work for all who claimed it.

Specially instructive was the great co-operative tailors' establishment set up by Blanc in the Hôtel Clichy, Paris, which for the purpose was transformed from a debtors' gaol. A detailed contemporaneous account appeared in *The Economist* of May 20, 1848.[2]

The experiment opened under singularly favourable auspices. "The Government," according to

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy.* Translated by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, p. 40.

[2] Quoted by Mr. M. D. O'Brien in his *Socialism Tested by Facts*, pp. 22–24. To this work reference should be made for a more detailed account of this interesting Socialistic experiment.

the report in *The Economist*, "made the buildings suitable for the purpose without rent or charge; furnished the capital, *without interest*, necessary to put it into immediate and full operation; and gave an order to commence with for 25,000 suits for the National Guard, to be followed by more for the Garde Mobile, and then for the regular troops." The Government further agreed to pay the same contract price as private enterprise demanded, viz. eleven francs per dress. Fifteen hundred men were started at work. In addition the Government undertook to *advance* each day two francs (1s. 7d.) to each man as "subsistence money," pending the ultimate division of profits. Finally, the accounts came to be squared.

The results are thus described in *The Economist*:[1]—

"Eleven francs per dress for so many dresses came to so much. The subsistence money at 1s. 7d. a day had to be deducted. The balance was to be provided as a profit. *Alas! it was a balance of loss, not of gain;* subsistence money had been paid equal to rather more, when it came to be calculated, than sixteen francs for each dress, in place of eleven francs, at which the master tailor would have made a profit, paid his rent, the interest of his capital, and good wages to his men, in place of a daily pittance for bare subsistence."

Why, then, this disastrous loss after a few weeks' work? The principal reason, as other contemporary accounts went to prove, was that as *each* felt that the benefits to be derived from extra exertion on his own part would be divided equally among the whole

[1] Quoted on p. 24 of *Socialism Tested by Facts*, by Mr. M. D. O'Brien.

1500 employed in the undertaking, none considered it worth their while to really bestir themselves.

Yet though such was the result when the proceeds were to be divided merely by 1500, this fact in no way deters English Socialists from to-day advocating the same course, *notwithstanding that the division here will be not by* 1500 *but by* 44 *millions*, or whatever is the precise present amount of the total population of the United Kingdom.

The Rt. Hon. J. Morley, M.P., in reply to a deputation of Labour and Socialist bodies, on January 6, 1906, thus summed up the history of the *ateliers nationaux*. The experiment of the State being compelled to provide work at a standard wage, said Mr. Morley, "was tried in France in 1848, and what was the effect? There they set up public workshops and the rest of it, and they paid a wage at a very high rate. The result was that private enterprise was drained dry. The end was ruin in six months, private workshops were injured, the men were no better off, and it ended in a bloody and sanguinary catastrophe."[1]

In conclusion, it may be added, France is still paying for the cost of the Socialistic experiments of 1848 in her National Debt.

Further, it has been authoritatively estimated that the loss on French securities on the Paris Stock Exchange during this period exceeded £160,000,000. Not only this, but almost every other form of French property depreciated proportionately in value.[2]

[1] *The Morning Post*, January 8, 1906.

[2] See Chevalier's *Organisation du Travail*, quoted by Professor Lecky in *Democracy and Liberty* (Cabinet edition), vol. ii. pp. 276 and 277.

Such, in brief, were the disastrous results attending the Socialistic experiments organised by Louis Blanc, one of the foremost, and other almost equally prominent leaders of Socialism, such as Ledru Rollin.

Under these circumstances it is not to be wondered at that Socialist writers in various countries have since been engaged in vainly attempting to explain away such damaging results.

Almost equally instructive is the course which events took subsequent to the suppression of the Revolution of 1848 in France. The fear of democracy run riot caused the people to seek an escape in the establishment of an autocracy, and dread of Socialism led to the casting of an overwhelming vote in favour of Louis Napoleon as President (December 1848).

VI

PROGRESS OR REACTION?

The Absence of a Constructive Policy on the Part of Socialism

Even were we to admit that Socialism is desirable as an ideal (and we are unable to make any such admission at all), the paramount question arises, "Is Socialism practicable?"

Amazing though it be, this is the matter to which the Socialists have given least attention. With fact and figure—for the most part exaggerated and wholly unreliable—Socialists indulge in destructive criticism of society as at present established, and satisfy themselves with flights of fanciful rhetoric as a recommendation of the future State. "If you believe in our ideals—join us. Do not cloud the issue by stopping at this moment to inquire by what precise means, and in what precise way, we propose to realise our ideals. It will be enough for the present if you join us. Leave it to your children, or to your children's children, to settle the details." Such is the class of appeal to which Socialist speakers daily give utterance.

There is only one description which is appropriate to tactics of this kind, and that is that they amount

to nothing less than an impudent repetition of "the confidence trick." For, while Socialists are with one breath assuring their followers that practical matters do *not* concern them at all, seeing that Socialism will not come in their day, at the same time the most active preparations are being made to rush Socialism into being within the next few years. Train-loads of Socialist literature are being issued, inviting the public to vote for definite Socialist candidates. These candidates are themselves bound by the strictest pledges to fulfil in the immediate present certain definite plans of campaign. Meetings are being held — literally by the thousand — every month, and Socialist M.P.'s are being returned to Parliament.

In the face of so treacherous a form of attack, it becomes all the more necessary to strenuously combat the Socialist assault. By subjecting the country to a vast campaign of destructive criticism, the Socialists seek to inveigle the nation into bestowing upon them a majority, *before* it realises the impracticability of their constructive policy.

The general attitude taken up by Socialists whenever a demand is made for details and for a constructive policy is well instanced in the following passage, which appears in one of Mr. Keir Hardie's most recent works: "To dogmatise about the form which the Socialist State shall take is to play the fool. That is a matter with which we have nothing whatever to do. It belongs to the future, and is a matter which posterity alone can decide. The most we can hope to do is to make the coming of Socialism possible, *in the full assurance that it will shape itself aright when it does come. . . . As for progress and development*

under Socialism, these may be safely left to care for themselves." [1] (The italics are our own.)

Mr. Sidney Webb, however, is a far shrewder tactician. This brilliant English Socialist is at variance with Mr. Keir Hardie in thus declining to even consider the question of a constructive policy.

Mr. Webb writes: "Now is the time to bring to bear a body of systematic and constructive political thought such as that with which the Philosophic Radicals won their great triumphs. The greatest need of the English Socialist party at this moment is men and women of brains, who will deliberately set themselves by serious study to work out the detailed application of Collectivist principles to the actual problems of modern life. We need to do a great deal more hard thinking in almost every department of our Socialist programme. I am appalled when I realise how little attention we have yet been able to pay to what I may call the Unsettled Questions of Democratic Administration." [2]

Mrs. Sidney Webb not long since delivered in the Essex Hall, London, the first lecture of a series to be given under the title of "The Faith I Hold," addressed to the Fabian Society. The exact date of this lecture is not stated, but the lecture is reported in the *Fabian News* for November 1907. We quote from this report the following passage:—

"*We fail to convince at present largely because, though we have feeling, we do not know enough about the facts and processes of life and government.* Our science is still insufficient. The Socialist must learn by exactly

[1] *From Serfdom to Socialism*, pp. 96 and 97.
[2] *Socialism; True and False*, by Sidney Webb, Fabian Tract No. 51, p. 8.

what measures we could stop the disastrous results of 'under employment' without hampering production ; how to stop jerry-building without making houses dear ; how to get full democratic control without lessening administrative efficiency.

"This is not given by feeling ; it involves scientific study. Even when he knows, the Socialist must learn how to present his knowledge so as to convince. *The mere writing of Socialist prescriptions will effect no cure.* We have to learn how to affect the minds of town councillors, Members of Parliament, officials, the scientific experts, even the electors themselves. *Our propaganda needs more careful study.* There must be division of labour. But, above all, in our scientific study and in our propaganda alike, the last word is Patience, Patience, and again Patience."

From the tactical standpoint Socialism has everything to gain by a continuance of its present plan of campaign. By reason of the very fact that it is engaged upon a fierce destructive criticism of existing society, its opponents are perpetually kept on the defensive. From the moment that Socialism is compelled to withstand an assault upon the nature of its constructive policy, the positions will be materially changed.

At present the Socialists are inviting the nation to entrust them with a blank cheque. They imagine that it is enough to indicate rhetorically and in general terms the benefits to accrue to all from the Socialist *régime*. And so long as the opponents of Socialism will allow them, the Socialists will remain silent as to details.

Progress or Reaction?

We have already referred to the position taken up by Mr. Keir Hardie, who represents the lavender Socialism of the Independent Labour Party. Equally instructive is the following statement by another leading English Socialist.

Mr. C. H. Norman writes: "Until Socialism has been given an opportunity of applying its salves to the gaping wounds which so weaken and impair the vitality of the working classes, even our bitterest opponents must admit that a condemnation of its principles cannot carry much weight; in other words, *the strength of the Socialist case lies in the fact that its efficacy has not been tested.*"[1]

If "the strength of the Socialist case lies in the fact that its efficacy has not been tested"—*i.e.* in the fact that it has not as yet been proved in practice to be a failure—would the nation really be justified in allowing these callow theorists to play havoc with our civilisation by way of experiment?

Mere tactics apart there is the best of reasons for the Socialists withholding a definite constructive policy. The Socialists do *not* possess such a policy. They have been so busily employed in laying the axe to the foundations of the existing structure that they have given practically no time to the study of that great complex problem, an all-reaching constructive system.

"It is," writes one of the leading Socialist writers on modern Socialism, Mr. John Spargo, "when we come to the question of the spirit of the economic organisation of the future, the methods of direction

[1] *Empire and Murder*, by C. H. Norman (The Twentieth Century Press), p. 3.

and management, that the light fails, and *we must grope our way into the great unknown. . . .*"[1]

Dr. Schäffle is accepted by the Socialists themselves as being a conspicuously fair and accurate inquirer into Socialism. This is his carefully weighed opinion regarding this matter: "Socialism, as at present formulated, has absolutely *not* attempted to establish by what means it intends to bring such an enormous mass of collective labour and collective capital in all its minutiæ to the pitch of profitable individual work."[2]

Further, Mr. Thomas Kirkup writes: Socialism "is a new type of industry and economic organisation the practicability of which must be decided by the test of experience. . . . The present competitive system must therefore be regarded as holding the field *until Socialism has given adequate proof of the practicability of the theory which it offers.*"[3]

The position, then, is briefly this: Mr. Sidney Webb is "appalled" when he realises "how little attention" has been paid by Socialists to this subject; Mr. Spargo announces that when inquiry is attempted into it "the light fails, and we must grope our way into the great unknown"; Dr. Schäffle states that "Socialism . . . has absolutely not attempted to establish" the means of achievement, and Mr. Kirkup, the Socialists' own historian, curtly affirms that the present system must stand "until Socialism has given adequate proof of the practicability of the theory which it offers."

[1] *Socialism*, by Mr. John Spargo, p. 224. Published in 1906.
[2] *The Quintessence of Socialism*, by Dr. Schäffle. Translated by Mr. Bosanquet, pp. 55 and 56.
[3] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, pp. 292 and 293.

Meanwhile Socialists clamour for votes on behalf of a theory the practicability of which has received from them little or no attention.

Surely the Socialists should lay before us the fullest possible particulars as to the details of Socialism in practice. Before the theory be tested, let the nation clearly know what it really is that is to be submitted to the test. House-builders are called upon to submit plans and specifications *before* the work is entrusted to them. With infinitely greater reason it should be demanded of State craftsmen, that before they destroy an existing system they should disclose the fullest possible details of their supplanting scheme.

This existing system, be it noted, whatever may be its defects, real or alleged, at all events has proved itself in practice a workable system.

So far as details of the Socialist policy have been obtainable, these have been carefully analysed by some of the cleverest intellects of the day, and their illusions laid bare.

M. Émile Faguet, a distinguished member of the Académie Française, as the outcome of the closest inquiry into the subject of Socialism, arrives at the conclusion that the Collectivist form of government could only be applied, if at all, to *small* countries.

Consider, he writes, the enormous bureaucracy it would require. . . . In order to replace the commerce, statistical bureaux would have to be established capable of foreseeing all the requirements of consumption, all the resources of production, all the means of currency, and also all the means of distribution and division. In place of the industrial chieftains, statistical bureaux would have to be

created, for the purpose of anticipating and calculating what it was necessary to produce in *each* of the industries. In one direction giving orders that work should be allowed to slacken off, in another that work should be expedited. Deciding as to the necessary apportionments, anticipating the deterioration of supplies, in addition to what other countless matters I know not.[1]

Will the Socialist *Régime* diminish the Industrial Productiveness of the Community?

The aims of the Socialists seem chiefly to be these: (1) That the hours of labour should be curtailed to the utmost possible limit; (2) that poverty and want shall wholly pass away, and every man enjoy all that he needs. Of course, these are also the aspirations of reformers who are non-Socialist.

It is sufficiently obvious that the needs of the community can only be satisfied by the productiveness of the community. The Socialists not only assume that under their system the production of the country will be equal to the supply of the people's wants, but they further expressly assert that the quantum of production will be enormously increased, and that by reason of that increase they will be able to materially shorten the hours of labour.

For centuries past men have worked for reward. Very few are to be found in industry who work for work's own sake. Men, for the most part, work for reward. The one motive that impels a man to do

[1] See *Le Socialisme en* 1907, p. 210.

more work than suffices to secure to him the bare necessaries of life is the desire for increased reward. Take away the possibility of increased reward, and, human nature being what it is, there forthwith is destroyed that which mainly tends to promote production.

The method of distribution under Socialism is a matter which must necessarily exercise a very profound influence upon the quantum of national production.

"Present-day Socialism," writes Dr. Schäffle, "insists upon distributing the divisible portion of the result of production, either in proportion to the time spent in labour . . . or, communistically, as in the Gotha programme, 'according to reasonable needs,' entirely *without* reference to the merit and productivity of each separate performance." [1]

Whichever of these two methods of distribution Socialism may finally elect to adopt "would," continues Dr. Schäffle, "absolutely crush out all willingness to labour on the part of the most skilful, and would thus result *in an incalculable diminution of the product of national labour, and hence also of wages.*" [2]

If the former of the two methods of distribution is insufficient to maintain the amount of production requisite to maintain the community in a condition of reasonable comfort, *à fortiori* this must be the case if the latter of the two be the accepted method.

It becomes necessary, then, to examine somewhat

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy.* Translated by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, p. 83.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

closely what consequences will probably flow from the adoption of the former of the two methods.

"It will not be sufficient by itself in a producing community of millions for producer A to feel: My income from my social labour is conditional upon my 999,999 co-operating comrades being as industrious as I. This will *not* suffice to awaken the necessary reciprocal control; at any rate, it will not stifle the impulse to laziness and to dishonesty, nor hinder men from defrauding the public of their labour-time, nor render impossible a cunning or prejudiced contrivance for the unjust valuation of individual performances."[1]

Socialism as a reasoned body of doctrine, as Mr. Mallock has emphasised, rests altogether on a theory of production. This theory involves the acceptance of the following far-reaching fallacy, namely, that "the faculties of men are so equal that one man produces as much wealth as another." Or, if any man in practice produces more, he would continue to produce the larger quantity, *even though the whole of the surplus be taken from him.* Hence it is argued by Socialists "that the existing rewards of ability are altogether superfluous," and that in the absence of such rewards production would still continue undiminished.[2]

Socialism, as here shown, declines to recognise the principles which govern human action, and which of necessity react, and *must* continue to react, upon the quantum of national production. As a consequence

[1] *Quintessence of Socialism*, by Dr. Schäffle. Translated by Mr. Bosanquet, pp. 56 and 57.
[2] *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, pp. 291 and 292.

of its action in this regard, Socialism would, in practice, intensify the very social diseases which it to-day so confidently purports to cure.

In Mr. Asquith's words the Socialist "so-called solution," "by slowly but surely drying up the reservoir which gives vitality to human personality and human purpose, will in the long run leave the universe a more sterile place."[1]

"He who produced goods of a really valuable kind, he who contributed the creative idea *which alone can set higher productivity on foot*, he who by some act of prudence and watchfulness has saved the revenue"—all these would in the Socialist State be entirely deprived, as observes Dr. Schäffle, of any proportionate reward.[2]

In view of the foregoing it is confidently submitted that the system of reward under Socialism must inevitably act disastrously on the good worker, and, in time at any rate, demoralise him. One result of this would be that the productiveness of the community would be correspondingly affected.

Unemployment and poverty are distressing facts which are to be found in all systems of society. The Socialists turn to these social maladies and seek to make much capital for themselves out of them. They claim that under Socialism there would be work for all, and that only the voluntary non-workers would starve.

Any State conducted upon Collectivist principles must, in the main, live out of and upon the present

[1] Budget Speech, House of Commons, April 18, 1907 (*The Morning Post*, April 19, 1907).

[2] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*. Translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 77.

production of its people. Work must not only be productive and necessary, but it must be largely self-supporting. Supposing that a large body of men were employed upon work which was either economically valueless or which, owing to being inefficiently executed, was not worth the amount equivalent to the support of these workers, the loss in such cases would have to be made good out of the product of the more efficient workers in the community.

Suppose that six men are stranded on some uninhabited island, and that four of them are keen and hard-working, and that the other two have neither the ability nor the will to work. The willing four must either support the useless two or allow them to starve. The two inefficients would naturally not be desirous of starving. They would consequently make a colourable pretence, at all events, of contributing to the common store. Possibly, as the result, the willing four would be called on to do, not four men's work, but the labour of five and a half men. The willing four would feel the injustice of this and take steps to compel the other two to do their fair share.

Not without reason, therefore, affirms M. Émile Faguet: "In truth, in the Socialist State I see half of the nation occupied in compelling the other half to work."[1]

Such a forecast receives entire corroboration from the past experience of communistic societies other than those actuated by religious fervour. (See chapter v., p. 156 *et seq.*)

[1] *Le Socialisme en* 1907, p. 221.

It may well be that in the present state of the labour market in this country the competition between the workers is painfully keen, yet none the less competition is essential. Under Socialism competition is to cease. As the result labour would be subjected to a maximum of inspection, and even then there would be secured only a minimum of production.

Socialism and "Unearned Increment"

The Socialists denounce "unearned increment." They point to the vast possessions of the very wealthy, and seek to enlist the sympathy of the envious in a Socialist crusade, on the ground that much of the existing wealth has been amassed owing to fortuitous circumstances beyond the control of the fortunate possessors.

Socialist speakers indulge in constant reference to the possessions of the Duke of Westminster and Lord Howard de Walden, and assure us that the former receives a guinea a minute and the latter half that sum. But the State has no right to claim the good bargains if it is not prepared to compensate those who have bad luck and make unfortunate bargains. The ordinary man has many deals and is content if on average he has something to the good. If in the name of "unearned increment" the State takes all his profit and leaves him with his losses, he has surely sound ground for complaint.

Rent and interest are shared in degrees by all sections of the community. The right by which the

rich man holds his land and enjoys his interest is identical with that of the small man.

It is idle, too, for the Socialists to argue that in some measure the rich man's income is not earned, but inherited, for the reason that they do not propose to respect the small man's investments, even though they be merely the wages which he has personally earned and saved. All talk, then, of any distinction between what is earned and what is not earned on the part of Socialists is wholly irrelevant, *so long as* Socialists contemplate the confiscation of *both* forms of property.

Further, Socialism, far from abolishing the existence of "unearned increment," will but result in its extension on a colossal scale. Under a system of distribution upon which reward is given irrespective of earnings, and upon which every man is to share in the total product equally "according to his needs," every single worker who produces less than the share of the product accorded to him will be in the enjoyment of "unearned increment."

Mr. Rae here clearly emphasises in the light of past experience the consequences which would accrue. ". . . The Socialist proposes to abolish the rich idler by a scheme which would breed the poor idler in overwhelming abundance, and for the sake of equalising poverty and wealth would really equalise indolence and industry. . . . Socialists find fault with the present order of things because the many workers support the few idlers, but most of the old Socialist communities of France and America failed because of the opposite and greater injustice, that *the few workers found themselves supporting the many*

idlers, and the consequence was a more harrowing sense of unfairness and a more universal impoverishment than prevailed under the old system."[1]

The Right of Inheritance and its Influence upon Production

Socialism, whether it finally elects to permit of inheritance or not, will in any case prohibit it from extending to anything of real value.

"The inheritance of such accumulated property," writes Mr. John Spargo, a prominent Socialist, "would, however, necessarily be denied, *society being the only possible inheritor of property*."[2]

This abolition of the right of inheritance (which, we admit, is essential, if Socialist principles are to be maintained), must further entail a vast diminution in production.

". . . The most powerful of all the springs of human progress," observes Professor Lecky, "is the desire of men to labour and to save for the benefit of those who will follow them."[3]

The desire on the part of a parent to make the best possible provision for his children is one which deserves all encouragement. This generous sentiment animates all classes of society. Many a man would abandon the struggle involved in the competition for advancement were it not for this powerful stimulus to work. Yet to all such motives Socialism would forthwith proceed to put an end.

[1] *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 10.
[2] *Socialism*, pp. 236 and 237. Published 1906.
[3] *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 227.

What would be the Effect of Socialism upon Invention?

The vital influence which invention has had in enlarging and cheapening production, as especially evidenced by the history of this country during the nineteenth century, is such as to render the probable action of Socialism upon invention a subject of supreme consequence.

If the effect of Socialism be to diminish invention, social progress becomes impossible.

"Socialism," Mr. Blatchford assures us, "would not endure competition." [1]

What effect will this abolition of all competition have on industrial progress? Progress is, as already here stated, dependent largely upon invention. "Necessity is the mother of invention," as states the old proverb.

With the abolition of competition would vanish, therefore, the chief mainspring of invention, since what principally to-day gives rise to fresh inventions is the desire in the industrial race to surpass one's competitors. Under the present industrial system the struggle of competition is unending; invention, accordingly, proceeds unceasingly.

That the present system directly makes for the improvement of machinery is admitted by the Socialist writer, Mr. Kirkup.

"With the development of the capitalistic system machinery is more and more perfected, for *to neglect improvement is to succumb in the struggle. . . .*" [2]

[1] *Merrie England*, p. 101.
[2] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 146.

Socialism, by putting an end to this competitive struggle, would as a consequence practically bring to a close all further development in invention.[1]

From Mr. Blatchford we learn what is to be the reward of the inventor under Socialism. "A workman invents a new process. He is *rewarded by a medal* and the naming of the process after its inventor, and the invention becomes the property of the State."[2]

Socialism, therefore, further assumes that the volume of invention will continue undiminished, despite the circumstance that the inventor is personally to be deprived of reaping any pecuniary profit whatsoever.

This, however, by no means represents the limits of their optimism, for Socialists assume that invention will not only continue under their system, but that it will very largely expand.

Regarding, as they do, manual labour as a tragedy, they delude their audiences by predicting a glorious day when machinery will do the greater part of the work which falls to living hands to-day.

Surely it will be conceded, however, that a State monopoly is the form of authority *least adapted* to readily provide the capital necessary to start an invention.

The important influence which, for example, Arkwright's invention of the spinning-frame had upon industrial progress is unlikely to be seriously questioned. To first start this invention capital, as in every case, had to be obtained. Private enterprise supplied it, but so great was the risk at the time

[1] See *Le Socialisme en* 1907, by M. Faguet, p. 236.
[2] *Merrie England*, p. 127.

considered, that the bank which originally financed the invention took fright and withdrew its support. Fortunately for subsequent generations, other individuals were found willing to subscribe the requisite amount.

In a risk regarded as great as that of the instance here quoted, does not the whole of past experience go conclusively to show that the State would not itself have ventured the necessary capital? The consequence would then have been that the old methods of spinning would have continued to obtain, and the community would have been *pro tanto* the poorer.

Not the least important of the many valuable points to which attention has been so ably called by Mr. Mallock is the following—namely, that to fully utilise modern inventions, and to maintain the conditions of industry which these inventions subserve, quite as much ability (though of a different character), is needed as was in the first place required to invent them.[1] Yet Socialism again expects this form of ability to continue to exert itself in the same, or in an even greater, degree than at present. This, notwithstanding the fact that ability is to be dispossessed of all reward which exceeds (at all events materially) that which is to be accorded to the least skilled form of manual labour.

Would Socialism be Hostile to Progress?

Further, to pass to another important branch of the subject, as Mr. Stanley Robertson asks, "What

[1] *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, p. 197.

machinery does Socialism provide for 'writing off' obsolete investments? Would a Socialist State ever have adopted the railway as its carrying machinery, and, if so, how would it have disposed of the collective capital invested in canals and stage-coaches?"[1]

The inventor's task is as a rule, we believe, only half complete by the time that he has perfected his invention. After that, assuming that he himself does not possess the capital required for the production of the invention, &c., he has to find a capitalist and to convince the latter of the value of his work.

Under Socialism the inventor would be wholly without capital, and the only capitalist would be the State. If the inventor failed to convince the particular official or officials in charge of that department of the advisability of supplying the requisite capital, his invention would stand for nothing but wasted labour. Under the present system there are tens of thousands of capitalists to any of whom the inventor may apply. For these, under Socialism, would be substituted one State department.

Probably there is no form of industrial investment which is, in most cases, more in the nature of a gamble than the financing of an invention. The Socialist State would certainly not be allowed, as a rule, to gamble in such a way. The Socialist State, with its annual Budget of social production, would to no small extent be living—capitalistically speaking—from hand to mouth. The amassing of State capital would be opposed rather than encouraged by

[1] "The Impracticability of Socialism," by Mr. Edward Stanley Robertson. Published in *A Plea for Liberty*, p. 45.

the bulk of the workers. For one of the foremost demands of the citizens would be that the workers should receive the full product of their labour, so far as this is practicable. They would require the equivalent in the form of the satisfaction of their immediate needs.

Further invention follows quickly on invention. What to-day represents a striking advance in the field of invention may within six months, or less, be obsolete and supplanted by some infinitely more ingenious device. Supposing that a Socialist State had invested in some new form of machinery, and had installed it throughout the country—would it not refuse to finance some other invention to accomplish the same results, even though the latter constituted a distinct advance upon the former? Progress, however, demands that the community should have the best as and when it is offered. Under competition the nation is assured of this. It is monopoly only that can afford to stand still—and at the expense of Progress.

Capital cannot be Abolished

Socialists when driven into a corner have reluctantly to admit that it is only the capitalist they seek to abolish, and that *capital itself must continue to exist.*

It will accordingly be necessary for the State "to capitalise a portion of each year's revenue." "Now," as Mr. Thomas Mackay pertinently remarks in the following important passage, "this superintendence of capital (under Socialism) will have to be paid for.

Inspectors and auditors will be required far beyond what is necessary under the present *régime*, where most men are dealing with their own and not their neighbour's property. The use of capital will not even here be given gratuitously. *Further, it would give rise to a perpetual dispute as to the amount of capital to be subtracted from the due meed of the labourer. The increment taken for capitalisation, and for the cost of superintendence, would be regarded as a tax and paid as grudgingly.* There would be a never-ending battle between the bureaucracy and the labourer. The former would naturally wish to increase the capital under their charge, and the labourer would resent all such deductions as a fraud on his claim." [1]

Socialism will intensify both Poverty and Misery

But if it be proved that Socialism provides no incentive to the workers capable of maintaining or developing production, and tends to the destruction of industrial progress and to increased cost, it necessarily follows that the claims of Socialism to abolish misery and poverty, one and all, go by the board. For how is it possible to more effectually augment such social evils than by diminishing the volume of production? By diminishing incentive to work and by decreasing invention, the result must be to reduce the total amount of the national income. Production will, in the opinion of M. Faguet, continue

[1] "Investment," by Mr. Thomas Mackay. Published in *A Plea for Liberty*, pp. 251, 252.

to decline under Socialism *until a stage is reached when*, owing to the fear that food may fail, man will again be compelled to exert his full energies. General poverty will accordingly under Socialism oscillate round the limit of what is strictly necessary to enable the workman to live and to reproduce his species without being able to sensibly rise above this limit.

The result then will be, states M. Faguet, to bring about the return of "the iron law of wages," and in a far more drastic and oppressive form than has ever previously been the case.

M. Faguet further holds that under Socialism "the iron law of wages" will frequently oscillate very sensibly *below* the standard necessary for the labourer to live and to reproduce his species ; and that it will fall on a labourer weakened and unaccustomed to make the abnormal effort to provide what is necessary.

Collectivism will produce indolence, indolence will bring about non-production, and non-production will of necessity lead to misery, and misery to depopulation.[1] Such is the chain of logical consequences predicted by M. Faguet in his closely reasoned chapter entitled *Le Collectivisme*.

The above conclusions receive striking corroboration from President Butler of Columbia University. "Under Socialism," writes President Butler, "industry would be reduced to the lowest level ever known in modern times ; everything which makes life agreeable would go out of it, and we should all be driven to a conflict and struggle for a bare subsistence to

[1] See *Le Socialisme en* 1907, pp. 247–250.

which the state of primitive war, as described by Hobbes, would be as nothing." [1]

Does the Success of existing State Industries tend to prove the Practicability of Socialism?

By way of attempted refutation of such arguments as the foregoing, Socialists point to what they claim as being instances of successful Socialist production and distribution to be found at the present time. The Post Office and carefully chosen Municipal trading ventures are seized upon by them as evidence of the greater triumphs in store in the Socialist future. How utterly fallacious is this claim will be evident on the briefest examination.

The terms of service and the basis of the reward of the employees are not Socialistic at all. On the contrary, they are intensely individualistic. Every man's fortune turns on the pivot of competition. Promotion, with an increased reward, represents the mainspring of all these services.

Further, many of these undertakings are in the nature of a monopoly. Consequently it is not possible to compare results in the form of productiveness and cost with similar criteria under purely competitive conditions. In such cases where this comparison is possible private enterprise nearly always shows an advantage.

From another standpoint State and Municipal control and trading supply an insufficient test of

[1] *True and False Democracy*, p. 57.

management. Under the existing system in such concerns as do not consist of monopolies, private enterprise is at the same time at work, and where the State or a Municipality under-estimates the demand upon its resources, private enterprise is ready at hand to complete the supply. Nothing that has been achieved up to the present time proves the ability of the State—if it stood alone—to make a self-sufficing social budget of production.

Regarded from another standpoint, the fact that State factories, administered under the present system, often attain considerable success in no way proves, as M. Faguet demonstrates, that the same will be the case when *all* are State owned.

At present the State is in a position to gauge the working capacity of its employees, and to enforce to the full that capacity. This it is enabled to do by comparison with privately-owned factories, and by saying, in effect, to its employees, Unless you comply with my conditions, you must seek employment elsewhere.[1]

No one knows the full extent of his capacity to work *until he is compelled to put forward his whole exertions.* The present system does, as M. Faguet observes, compel the worker to fully exert himself, and therefore teaches him his maximum capacity.

The Collectivist system, on the other hand, would provide no such compulsion, with the result that even the individual would himself remain ignorant as to what is the maximum extent of his capacity to labour.[2]

[1] See *Le Socialisme en* 1907, p. 234.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 229.

What are to be the Relations between Officials and Employees?

The question of production under Socialism is necessarily also intimately connected with the question as to what are to be the rights and duties of the workers under the new system.

That this is a matter of primary importance few will be prepared to question.

The Socialist writer, Mr. Spargo, assures us that "we must face the fact that, in anything worthy of the name of an industrial democracy, the terms and conditions of employment cannot be decided wholly without regard to the will of the workers themselves, on the one hand; nor, on the other hand, by the workers alone without reference to the general body of the citizenry. If the former method fails to satisfy the requirements of democracy by ignoring the will of the workers in the organisation of industry, the alternative method involves *a hierarchical government equally incompatible with democracy*."[1]

Take, in this connection, a matter with which the Socialist State might at any time be imperatively called upon to deal — namely, where supply in some particular branch of industry outstrips the demand.

In such an event the Socialist State would either have to reduce the value of the surplus product, thus entailing the abandonment of the Socialist theory of value, *or* the supply of the next usual period would have to be reduced.

In the latter case some portion of the workmen

[1] *Socialism*, by Mr. John Spargo, pp. 225, 226.

hitherto employed in that particular industry would have to be transferred to some other industry. It would be impossible for the Socialist State to passively allow these workmen to remain idle, and at the same time to share in the general produce of the State. Accordingly, were these superfluous workmen to decline to be transferred to some other locality, or to refuse to work in some other industry, the Socialist State would be compelled to have recourse to compulsion.

The method of dealing with such a contingency has already received consideration from Socialists. A leading English Socialist writer emphasises in the following passage the fact that the individual will have to accept whatever calling the State may from time to time prescribe.

"But it is quite possible," writes Mrs. Annie Besant, "that . . . Jeshurun will wax fat and kick, if, when he prefers to make microscope lenses, he is desired to make mirrors. Under these circumstances, Jeshurun will, I fear, *have to accommodate himself to the demand.*" [1]

All that this implies would have been more evident had Mrs. Besant chosen some rather more forcible instance of what the State demands may, under Socialism, amount to. As, for example, were the letter-sorter compelled to transfer his labour to the coal-mine, or to the sewer, to which Mrs. Besant herself later refers.

Socialists frequently endeavour to foist upon their audiences the specious fallacy that because the existing State employees are free, such will necessarily

[1] "Industry under Socialism." *The Fabian Essays*, pp. 159, 160.

be the condition of the workers throughout the Socialist State.

To-day the former are free *because they are not absolutely compelled to remain State employees*, but can seek employment elsewhere if they so wish. In the Socialistic State no such alternative form of employment would exist, *as State employment would be the sole form of employment.* Emigration, if permitted, and if any country remained open to emigrants, would be the only remedy available under Socialism to those who, rightly or wrongly, might consider themselves ill-used or harshly treated.

A Fundamental Fallacy of Socialism

The idea on the part of Socialists, that it is necessary to establish a wholly new method of distribution in order to advantage "labour," amounts to a colossal error. The result, as shown above, will inevitably be to most prejudicially affect production.

Even grant, for the sake of argument, that the method of distribution under Socialism is more just than that which prevails to-day (which it is not), to what advantage is it to work improvements in distribution if industrial and economic progress is to cease and production to diminish?

It is for Socialism to prove not only that its method of distribution will be more in accord with justice, but also that the amount to be distributed will not suffer as a consequence of the adoption of Socialism.

"If this exploitation or use and oppression of one man by another," writes President Butler, "were shown to be a necessary and inevitable result of

society as now ordered and established, then might we well believe that the Socialist propaganda, if it could make clear that Socialism would bring such exploitation to an end, would go forward with increasing energy and success. But it must be pointed out that the exploitation of one individual by another is *not* a necessary, but an incidental, consequence of the existing social order, and that, bad as it is, *its results are in no sense comparable with the evils of the exploitation of one by all, which is the necessary consequence of the establishment of a Socialistic democracy.* For the exploitation of one by all puts an end to liberty. *We should not gain anything by substituting the more injurious form of exploitation for the less injurious;* we should, rather, lose much."[1]

Socialism, in fact, confounds the whole issue so far as "labour" is concerned. Its adoption, in lieu of alleviating the burdens of "labour," would instead but aggravate and intensify them.

The policy which the labourer has to set before him "is," writes Mr. Mallock, as a conclusion to a most able course of reasoning, "*not how to undermine a vast system which is hostile to him,*" *but merely how* "*to accommodate more completely to his needs a system which has been, and is, constantly working in his favour.*"[2] In support of this deduction Mr. Mallock adduces the fact that the income of the labouring classes in the year 1880 (*after making all necessary deductions in respect of the increase in population*), was in this country more than equal to the *combined income of all classes* in the year 1850.[3]

[1] *True and False Democracy*, pp. 20 and 21.
[2] *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, p. 321.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 322.

This progress is continuing to-day. Socialism would, if put into practice, not only *not* accelerate the rate of progress, but would put an end to all progress.

To destroy the existing industrial and economic system would be a matter of comparative simplicity. Socialism, however, at present furnishes *no* proofs of any constructive policy, which is fitted to take its place.

In referring to what is still to-day the predominant school of economic thought in modern Socialism, Mr. Thomas Kirkup frankly admits: "The abstract Collectivism which is the prominent economic feature of his (Marx's) school suggests two serious doubts: *if by a revolutionary act they took the delicate and complex social mechanism to pieces, whether they would be able to put it together again; and if they did succeed in putting it together, whether it would work.*" [1]

The whole of the foregoing analysis leads then unmistakably to the conclusion which Mr. Balfour recently summed up as follows: "The productive energies of this country must in the future, as in the past, be based upon the individual energy of its citizens, and that individual energy can only be called forth *by a system based upon the fact that what a man earns he possesses,* and no greater injury can be done to the working classes of this country than to spread that feeling of insecurity about private property, which is not the safeguard of the possessions of the rich so much as the absolute conditions upon which the production of rich and poor alike can alone successfully be carried on." [2]

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 377.
[2] Speech at Aston, November 15, 1907.

Socialism and Foreign Trade

For no country does the bearing of Socialism upon foreign trade possess greater importance than for the United Kingdom. This is the case both on account of the enormous dimensions (whether considered absolutely or relatively) which this form of trade has now assumed, and also owing to the highly artificial channels into which our civilisation during the past century has so rapidly tended.

This country has long since ceased to provide the food which the ever-growing population of the United Kingdom requires. On over-sea supplies and on foreign and Colonial markets England has come to depend more and more. This is the case not only in regard to food supplies, but also in respect of industrial employment. Consequently, England, of all civilised countries in the world, is the one *least fitted* to abandon her foreign trade.

The following table of statistics sufficiently evidences the magnitude of this form of trade at the present time:—

United Kingdom

Year ending Dec. 31	Value of Imports	Value of Exports
1905	£565,000,000	£329,000,000
1906	£607,000,000	£375,000,000
1907[1]	£645,000,000	£426,000,000

In regard to this subject the Socialist finds himself in this dilemma, as described by Professor Flint: "If the State engage in and encourage foreign trade,

[1] Note.—The figures here given for the year 1907 are preliminary only, and as revised may possibly be somewhat different.

it will fail to get free of the competition which Socialists denounce, and must conform its agricultural policy to that of its competitors. If it (the State) set itself against foreign trade, it will be unable to feed a large population, and must be content to rule a poor and feeble nation."[1]

In the following statement Professor Graham arrives at much the same conclusion as does Professor Flint: For a Socialist State, "foreign trade would be impossible without surrendering the Collectivist principle, and the destruction of foreign trade would be ruinous to a country like England."[2]

The fact from which Socialism is unable to break loose is, that for a Socialist State to maintain its export trade in competition with non-Socialistic countries would be an impossibility. "Socialism," asserts Mr. Robert Blatchford, "would not endure competition."[3]

To carry this matter a stage further, the Socialist State would not only refuse to permit of competition, but would by its very nature be unable to maintain itself under competition.

This circumstance accounts no doubt in part for the inherent anti-national and international character of Socialism. (See as to this chapter iv.)

The Times, in a leading article on September 7, 1907, wrote as follows: "The stress laid by Socialists upon international solidarity shows that they realise, consciously or unconsciously, that all nations, or at least the more important ones, must make the plunge

[1] *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, p. 230.
[2] *Socialism, New and Old*, p. 260.
[3] *Merrie England*, p. 101.

simultaneously, if it is to be made at all. Any country which took the initiative in abolishing private property and individual incentive by handing over all economic functions to a department of State would fare very much as a country which took the initiative in disarming ; it would be at the mercy of the rest, and would be promptly ruined. . . . The conviction or intuitive perception of this truth is at the bottom of the vehement antagonism to national feeling shown by so many Socialists ; they hate patriotism because it offers a formidable obstacle to their plans. . . ."

How little do Socialists realise for the most part the extent of what they rashly propose to abandon in the pursuit of the Socialistic chimera !

Mr. Thomas Kirkup provides a passage in his history bearing on this subject, the truth of which reflection serves but to enhance.

"Even the very simple breakfast of an ordinary citizen is a great international function, in which the productions of the most diverse countries combine to appease his wants." [1]

Of durable and perishable material things, nearly one-half, as Mr. Mallock observes,[2] of the total consumed in the United Kingdom comes from other portions of the Empire and from foreign countries. These consist principally *not* of articles of luxury, but of such important articles of every-day consumption as bread, meat, tea, coffee, sugar, eggs, fruit, vegetables, &c., in addition to raw materials of every kind.

To cite but one example of this latter. In 1907

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 170.
[2] *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, p. 66.

the cotton industry of this country exported articles "wholly or mainly manufactured" to the value of £110,438,000. This most important industry in England depends for its raw material *wholly* on extraneous sources. The imports of cotton for 1907, under the heading of "Raw Materials and Articles mainly unmanufactured," amounted in value to £70,808,000.

Moreover, if the export trade of this country were to cease, not only would the United Kingdom have to become entirely self-supporting in the matter of food-supply, as well as of raw material, but fresh sources of livelihood would, in addition, have to be provided for a very large percentage of the population.

The Board of Trade in the *Fiscal Blue Book* (Cd. 1761 of 1903, p. 361), estimated the total wages bill of the United Kingdom at between £700,000,000 and £750,000,000, according to the state of employment.

Further, the Board arrived at the conclusion that "the proportion of the total labour of the British working classes which is concerned with production of commodities for export (including the making up of the instruments of their production and their transport to the ports) is between one-fifth and one-sixth of the whole."

In other words, the export trade then represented approximately in wages to the working classes of the United Kingdom £140,000,000 per annum, according to this estimate of the Board of Trade.

Since the date of this return the export trade of the United Kingdom has markedly increased, so that

the present total would be considerably larger than that quoted above.

The same fact also points to the strong probability that the proportion of workers employed in this form of trade has also increased meanwhile.

Foreign Investments of the United Kingdom

Closely akin to this subject of foreign trade is that of foreign and over-seas investments by persons resident in the United Kingdom.

"In 1898," states the Board of Trade Blue Book, issued in 1903, "Sir Robert Giffen estimated the total (income from foreign investments) at £90,000,000, and this estimate, though not established by official evidence, is not inconsistent with the partial official figures. . . ."[1]

The Statist, in a leading article on October 12, 1907, writes: "There is no doubt that the sums annually due to this country for interest on capital employed abroad, services rendered by our ship-owners and insurance companies, by bankers and others, involve the payment to the United Kingdom of upwards of 200 (two hundred) millions sterling. . . ."

Again, in an earlier article of July 20, 1907, *The Statist* estimated the *approximate amount of British capital invested in colonial and foreign countries since the year* 1855 *at* £1,670,000,000.

In the same article it is calculated "that the amount of capital actually subscribed by British investors in the past twelve months has been about £80,000,000."

[1] Cd. 1761 of 1903, p. 103.

In a still later article, dated January 11, 1908, *The Statist* writes: "In the calendar year 1907 we have subscribed over £90,000,000 of capital for India, the Colonies, and for foreign countries, and after making the necessary deductions for conversions, &c., the *net* amount is still about £80,000,000."

The amount of capital thus subscribed during the year 1907, *The Statist* proceeds in this article to allocate as follows:—

Foreign Countries	£66,034,225
India	7,218,087
British Colonies	20,559,364
Total	£93,811,676

The Commissioners of Inland Revenue for this country in their Report, issued in August 1907, estimate the amount of "identified" income derived from foreign investments as follows:—

Year.		£
1903–1904	=	65,865,306
1904–1905	=	66,062,109
1905–1906	=	73,899,265

"Beyond this ear-marked figure," state the Inland Revenue Commissioners, "there exists a large amount of income from abroad which, in many cases, cannot be identified . . . and which is therefore included in the sum of £367,814,155 appearing under the head of 'Businesses, Professions, &c., not otherwise detailed.'"

The fluidity of capital is entirely ignored by the Socialist. It is on the face of it evident that a Socialist majority would have *no* power to confiscate income derivable from investments *outside* the United

Kingdom. Were Socialism in this country to prove victorious, the holders of such investments would long before have taken the necessary steps to prevent such income from being remitted within reach of the State which declined to recognise private property, and which did not scruple to justify expropriation.

The community, therefore, would in this country be *pro tanto* the poorer. It is easy for the Socialist to denounce with fiery invective the private ownership of capital, but the fiercer the denunciation the more efficacious is it in promoting the migration of capital. Such action, therefore, tends to vindicate once again the truth of the old saw, "First catch your hare, then cook it."

Incidentally it may here be noted that the greater security for capital which this country in the past has for a century and upwards been considered to confer, has done much to conduce to the investment of foreign capital in British Government funds, &c. This feeling of security on the part of Continental and other investors has very largely tended to promote in this country "cheap money." It has thus directly and materially contributed to the industrial progress and expansion of Great Britain.

The destruction of such a feeling of security on the part of investors must necessarily detrimentally affect our industries. Thus Socialism by its action will in this country be depriving the community of yet another factor which has materially contributed to its industrial and commercial progress and success, and which has tended to assist towards providing employment for the present relatively vast population

of the United Kingdom. This population, it should be recollected, has grown up under artificial conditions, and can to-day only be maintained under artificial conditions.

In conclusion, we would call attention to the following powerful criticism of Professor Lecky :—

"It is also sufficiently obvious," wrote Professor Lecky, "that the first condition of the success of a Socialistic community is complete isolation. Socialism is essentially opposed to Free Trade and international commerce. It is conceivable that in some remote island of the Pacific, the whole population might be organised into one great co-operative society, in which each member filled an assigned part and discharged an assigned duty in obedience to the authority of the whole. But this organisation must be stereotyped. It must be kept separate, drilled and disciplined like a regiment of soldiers. It is absolutely inconceivable that such a state of society could exist in a vast, fluctuating, highly locomotive population, spreading over a great part of the globe, deriving its subsistence from many distant countries, bound to them by the closest commercial ties, continually sending out vast streams of emigrants, continually absorbing into itself Indian, colonial, and alien populations. To organise such a people on the plan and in the framework of a Socialist State is the idlest of dreams." [1]

[1] *Liberty and Democracy*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. pp. 368 and 369.

VII

LIBERTY AND EQUALITY

The Delusive Promises of Socialism

One often hears park Socialists and others announce that they date their conversion to Socialism from the hour that they first became "class-conscious." Probably four-fifths of the crusade on behalf of militant Socialism is an attempt to find expression for this "class-consciousness." The aim, of course, is that by means of a class war all other classes—except the working class—are to cease to exist. The keynote of the new ordering of society is: "All wealth is produced by Labour solely. Therefore if Labour is in future to receive the whole of its produce, everything must belong to Labour, and if a man of suitable years and strength will not work, he must starve."

We are consequently told that in the future "class Equality" is, under Socialism, easy of realisation. There is to be *only one* class—the Labouring class.

In another chapter, viz., in chapter ix. (see pp. 264–268, and pp. 298–305), we reply to the wholly untenable doctrine that "Labour is the sole source of wealth." Here it is proposed to show that in view of the complex character of modern industrialism, it

is absurd to imagine that, whatever its form of government may be, any State could be controlled by a single class. Further, it will be demonstrated that it is equally impossible for an Equality of condition to be enforced—arbitrarily or otherwise—as between the forty odd million members who go to form the present population of the United Kingdom.

It will be clear that a superior class could be formed in either of the two following ways :—

(1) A typical Governing class—probably tending to become to a large extent hereditary.

(2) A privileged Labouring class. Such a class would inevitably come into being, *unless* there were the strictest equality of reward—wholly irrespective of merit.

First as to the "governing class" under Socialism. The mere abolition of property in private hands, as it is possessed to-day, would be no safeguard against its formation. Indeed, such a class would be a necessity. In all forms of civilised society there must be both an executive and an administrative. Even nowadays we do not measure the strength of our public men in terms of money. Ability is the standard. Their reward is by means of public recognition meted out to them in the form of the increased strength of their hold on public acceptance. Able discharge of their duties wins for them a securer hold on office, deeper trust from the people, wider influence, and POWER.

We have a saying that "Money is power." In many phases of life to-day the fight is between the power of ability and the power of wealth. Make wealth of no account, and from that moment the

power of ability will be stronger than it ever has been in the history of the world.

In a Socialist State, however, the governing class will not be limited, in point of influence and power, to the mere control of the political affairs of the State or to the administration of present-day municipal matters. In their hands will, in addition, be vested the whole of the vast industrial organisation of the country. Upon them the countless problems attending production and distribution will devolve ; the difficult question of exchange (and in this connection the determining of an equation of labour value) will be entrusted to them ; and from them a countless host of minor officials will take their orders.

The question of what the social budget of production for the year shall contain will be determined by officials ; if, indeed, it can be determined at all. Under-production would result in great hardship, if not in actual famine ; whilst over-production of perishable stores would be regarded as a scandal. Indeed, the over-production of anything would be prolific of popular discontent, in that it would unnecessarily have accentuated "the tragedy of toil."

It will be realised, also, that the workers, as distinguished from the controllers, are too closely interested personally to be safely allowed to decide for themselves in many matters. An independent authority is essential to decide the claims of conflicting branches of Industry.

The aim of the State as a producer would be to supply just enough for the needs of the citizens, with

the lightest possible demands upon the workers. This it would have to seek to do upon terms of equality as regards the calls upon labour in the various industries. It would not be possible for the workers themselves to decide, for instance, the exact number of hours in a coal-mine which would entitle the collier to the same reward as a school-teacher, if equal remuneration for all came to be the accepted method of distribution. Clearly, only a class wholly independent of the workers involved could determine the equation of labour value.

There would also be other similar matters, such as the sanctioning of the choice of employment—even if it were found practicable to offer the individual worker any such choice at all.

"The Commonwealth," writes Mr. Laurence Gronlund, the Socialist author, in referring to the Socialistic State, "while it guarantees suitable employment, can certainly *not* guarantee a particular employment to everybody."[1]

The Socialist proposal (as put forward from some quarters) is that in attractive employments, to which of course there would be a rush, the candidate should either undergo examination or draw lots. In point of impracticability there is little to choose between the two suggestions. Examination sounds plausible, but what is the use of examining a man for a manual trade which he has not learnt, or training him for one which he may not ultimately be allowed to follow? Surely, at any rate, experience has taught that efficient and practical men but seldom come straight from the examination table. The drawing

[1] *The Co-operative Commonwealth*, p. 115.

of lots is a deliciously frank anticipation of the failure of rational organisation to cope with this primary difficulty of Socialism. Would not this, however, be a *reductio ad absurdum* of the "Equality of Opportunity"? Such a course would be characteristically Socialistic, in that it would cynically and entirely ignore the claims of individual efficiency. Is it not clear, then, that the question of individual employment is another of the many matters which could only be settled, and that arbitrarily, by a governing class?

The selection of homes for the workers (all Lancashire would probably "plump" for Blackpool) is yet another matter which the workers themselves could not be allowed to decide. Similarly with the land. Some would have to work the lean acres. An examination would be useless so far as deciding such a question, unless the men on top were to be put to work the lean acres.

Having regard to the fact that the whole of the industries of the country are to be controlled by the State, Socialism will have to fall back upon an army of State controllers, of numbers undreamt of. How are these to be chosen? By election, of course, say, in most cases, the Socialists. The thing is inconceivable. Even now with our smaller bodies of officials, it is the custom merely to elect our representatives and to leave it to them to select and appoint their officials. In the incomparably larger officialdom of Socialism the same course in practice would most certainly have to be followed.

Although as the result of periodical State elections the chief executive officers of the State might be

changed, yet it would be impossible to make an entire change on these occasions of the officials. Such a course would involve an amount of administrative chaos as would fatally hamper production.

This consequent security of employment would carry with it the inevitable results. The officials, recognising that while they could not be ejected in a body they yet might be removed individually, would proceed to form a union for mutual protection. As without their co-operation, the elected representatives of the people would be powerless to succeed in their work in such a way as would be likely to lead to their re-election, it is not difficult to foresee that the men who would appoint the officials would speedily be in the power of the officials. Consequently the elective representatives would be compelled to appoint *such persons as the officials desired.* These views find support in the following Socialist statement, which comes from Mr. John Spargo :—

"Democracy in the sense of popular self-government, the 'government of the people, by the people, and for the people,' of which political rhetoricians boast, is only approximately obtainable . . . . all cannot participate directly in the administrative power, and it becomes necessary therefore to adopt the principle of delegated authority, representative government."[1]

In countries in which Universal Suffrage to-day exists, is it, in practice, found that the masses themselves govern? No. Their right is limited to choosing those who shall govern them, with the consequent result that they are none the less ruled over.

[1] *Socialism.* By Mr. John Spargo, pp. 215 and 216. Published 1906.

In the chapter descriptive of "Industry under Socialism" in the *Fabian Essays*, Mrs. Annie Besant writes: "I do not believe that the direct election of the manager and foreman by the employees would be found to work well in practice, or to be consistent with the discipline necessary in carrying on any large business undertaking." [1]

Further, the point here raised, that the very immensity of the machine which the Socialist State is to be called upon to control will render the enforcement of subordination and strict discipline all the more essential, is supported by one of the most brilliant of present-day English Socialist writers and thinkers.

"If a man wants freedom to work or not to work just as he likes," writes Mr. Sidney Webb, "he had better emigrate to Robinson Crusoe's island, or else become a millionaire. *To suppose that the industrial affairs of a complicated industrial State can be run without strict subordination and discipline, without obedience to orders, and without definite allowances for maintenance*, is to dream not of Socialism but of Anarchism." [2]

"*Strict subordination and discipline*," and "*obedience to orders*"—what are they but the proofs of the

[1] Page 158.

NOTE.—Mr. Laurence Gronlund in *The Co-operative Commonwealth* realises how unpopular such action on the part of the State would be. In his opinion, "That the workers in a factory should elect their foreman, teachers their superintendents, and so forth . . . is the only method by which harmonious and loyal co-operation of subordinates with superiors can be secured. No one ought to be a superior without the goodwill of those he has to direct."

Even Mr. Gronlund appears to have qualms as to whether this method will in practice work, and therefore supplements this by stating: "It should be added that appointment from below does *not* necessarily imply removal from below" (page 127).

[2] *Fabian Tracts*, No. 51, p. 18.

existence of a governing and a servient class? How little mention is made of such essentialities by the ordinary Socialist agitator?

Yet another English Socialist writer sounds much the same note of warning.

Mr. H. G. Wells in an article on Socialism, published in *The Fortnightly Review* for November 1906, proceeds to state:—

"All the wide world of collateral consequences that will follow from the cessation of the system of employment under conditions of individualist competition, he" (*i.e.* the ordinary Socialist working man) "does not seem to apprehend. . . . Nor does he realise for a long time that for Socialism and under Socialist institutions will there be needed any system of self-discipline, any rules of conduct further than the natural impulses and the native goodness of man."

Socialists realise that the promised abolition of class distinctions is one of the most attractive of the proposals which they dangle before the ignorant.

Their assertions on this head are vehement and resolute. For example, "Socialism," asserts Mr. J. L. Joynes in *The Socialist Catechism*,[1] "implies the abolition of class distinctions."

"Under Ideal Socialism," we learn from Mr. Robert Blatchford, "the only difference between a Prime Minister and a collier would be the difference of rank and occupation."[2]

A difference in rank, forsooth? If the single class idea were practicable the Premier would merely be

[1] Published by The Twentieth Century Press, p. 16.
[2] *Merrie England*, p. 103.

one of the class. The word "rank" is charged with other suggestiveness. The test, however, is Power. If the Premier and his colleagues have more power than that possessed by any individual elector, *there is at once a negation of equality*, and probably an infraction of individual rights of self-control as well.

Mr. H. M. Hyndman has himself foretold some of the consequences likely to accrue from the extension of State control and the creation of a bureaucracy.

"But do not let us forget that in so far as this tends simply to State control it may mean the control of a bureaucracy and the domination of experts. That entails with it *a sort of qualified slavery*." Further, added Mr. Hyndman, "There is no more offensive prig than a bureaucrat, none more wholly impervious to reason when his conceit of himself is threatened." [1]

Mr. Herbert Spencer thus destructively criticised the equality promised by Socialism :—

"Some kind of organisation labour must have, and if it is not that which arises by agreement under free competition, it must be that which is imposed by authority. Unlike in appearance and names as it may be to the old order of slaves and serfs working under masters, who were coerced by barons, who were themselves vassals of dukes or kings, the new order wished for, constituted by workers under foremen of small groups, overlooked by superintendents, who are subject to higher local managers, who are controlled by superiors of districts, themselves under a central government, must be essentially the same in

[1] *Social Democracy* (Reprint of a Lecture delivered at Queen's Hall, London, April 14, 1904), p. 21.

principle. . . . Without alternative the work must be done, and without alternative the benefit, whatever it may be, must be accepted. For the worker may not leave his place at will and offer himself elsewhere. Under such a system he cannot be accepted elsewhere, save by order of the authorities."[1]

The results likely to accrue from Socialism in this respect are summed up by Professor Flint as follows: "Socialism of its very nature so absorbs the individual in society as to sacrifice his rights to its authority. . . . It denies to the individual any rights independent of society, and assigns to society authority to do whatever it deems for its own good with the persons, faculties, and possessions of individuals. It undertakes to relieve individuals of what are manifestly their own moral responsibilities, and proposes to deprive them of the means of fulfilling them. *It would place the masses of mankind completely at the mercy of a comparatively small and highly centralised body of organisers and administrators entrusted with such powers as no human hands can safely or righteously wield.*"[2]

". . . As the 'expert' comes to the front, and 'efficiency' becomes the watchword of administration, all that was human in Socialism," to quote some words of Mr. Hobhouse, "vanishes out of it. Its tenderness for the losers in the race, its protests against class tyranny, its revolt against commercial materialism," all the sources of the Socialist doctrines are gone like a dream, and "instead we have the conception of society as a perfect piece of machinery pulled by wires radiating from a single centre, and

[1] *A Plea for Liberty*, Introduction, pp. 10 and 11.
[2] *Socialism*, pp. 373 and 374.

all men and women are either 'experts' or puppets." Humanity, Liberty, Justice vanish.[1]

"The ultimate result," if Socialism became the policy of the State, wrote Mr. Herbert Spencer, "must be a society like that of ancient Peru . . . in which the mass of the people, elaborately regimented in groups of 10, 50, 100, 500, and 1000, ruled by officers of corresponding grades, and tied to their districts, were superintended in their private lives as well as in their industries, and toiled hopelessly for the support of the governmental organisation." [2]

In theory, as in practice, Socialism has had for its form of government a thorough despotism, the only form possible for a Communistic society. Such, for example, was the form of government depicted in Thomas Campanella's celebrated work, *The City of the Sun* (published first in 1623). Like Plato, Sir Thomas More[3] considered a slave class essential to the working of his scheme.

As Baron Eötvös has written, Communism "cannot subsist without absolutism ; and it would be doing injustice to the Communists to suppose that they themselves have not seen into this necessary consequence of their system. Not only have prominent teachers in the Communistic school, but even those who have employed themselves in framing constitutions for Utopias . . . have acknowledged that an authority with all power vested in it was, for this end, indispensable." [4]

[1] Mr. L. T. Hobhouse, *Democracy and Reaction*, p. 228.
[2] *A Plea for Liberty*, Introduction, p. 26.
[3] More's *Utopia* was published in 1515.
[4] Quoted in Professor Woolsey's *Communism and Socialism*, p. 268.

We are faced, then, by the fact that it is wholly impossible to establish real Equality without destroying Liberty, since those invested with Liberty promptly utilise this privilege to advance their own position.

The inevitable result, consequently, of the continued existence of Liberty is the creation of further Inequality. Whilst, similarly, complete Equality involves the destruction of Liberty. The absolute Equality dreamed of by the Socialist can, therefore, never be maintained in the absence of a despotic rule fundamentally opposed to the existence of Liberty.

The very division of the citizens into classes of controllers and controlled presupposes not only an Inequality in *status*, but also, in all probability, an unequal enjoyment of Liberty. It may be urged to the contrary that the controlling class will be possessed of no rights except those which the controlled voluntarily confer on them. That may possibly be the case at the inception. Later, when the official class has become firmly established, it is far more probable that the controlled will have just those rights, and no more, which the controllers are disposed to entrust to them.

Dr. Schäffle forecasts that in the Socialist State "the leading rams of the modern democratic flock, whom all the sheep follow, would be the sole actual legislators, rulers, and administrators, and would in all probability not be of the best and most capable, but the most thorough-going demagogues, the most successful flatterers of the many-headed monarch."[1]

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, p. 124.

Certainly all the history of the past goes to justify this prediction.

Surely if this be the case, and rank amongst the officials is the reward of Socialist political service, once the leaders and the chief workers are securely enthroned as officials, who is to expel them? Alternatively, who is to fill their place if, and when, they are driven out? It requires considerable credulity to assume that the ability to make a Socialist speech in Hyde Park is sufficient proof in most cases of the existence of the qualifications necessary to control the vast commercial and industrial undertakings of this country.

There is another point of which Socialist speakers dislike to be reminded. The officials will (according to Socialist doctrines) be a non-producing class. Their upkeep will be set down to State maintenance, and the very considerable cost of housing, feeding, and clothing them will be one of the many deductions to be made from the product of labour before it passes to the producer. Notwithstanding, these officials in embryo have the effrontery to assure their dupes that if only they will vote for Socialism, the whole of the product of their labour will forthwith be their own.

We may be sure, also, that just as recent events show that some of the branches of trade unions delight in forming a ring-fence, so officialism would, under Socialism, jealously protect itself from outsiders. If meritorious workmanship in the labouring and servient class were to be recognised by promotion to officialdom, a dismal descent from officialdom to the labouring class would in cases be involved.

As, however, the official classes would be the judges as to whether the workmanship was meritorious or not, their own position would be sufficiently safeguarded.

Socialism, by prohibiting any one from rising out of the ranks of labour, or earning more, or materially more, than another, constitutes a system of "levelling down," and *not*, as is claimed for it, one of "levelling up."

Such a system neither puts an end to what it designates as "wage slavery," nor causes the labourer to cease to be a labourer. Instead, it rivets on ALL *outside the class of State officials* both of these conditions.

"The producers," writes Dr. Schäffle, "would still be, individually, no more than workmen. . . ."[1] The only difference would be that they would be completely at the mercy of their foremen.

Further, the fact that in respect of the payment of wages under the Socialist State the truck system is probably to be reintroduced, certainly will *not* tend to render the workman any the less a "wage slave," as all past experience goes to prove.

The position of the officials would only be unassailable from the moment that the servient class were in complete subjection. It would always be possible for them, if trouble were threatened, to successfully play one industry off against another. If, for instance, the bricklayers were dissatisfied with their equation of labour value, there would be but little difficulty in convincing other trades that if the bricklayers were allowed to work shorter hours, the

[1] *The Quintessence of Socialism*, translated by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, p. 8.

general productivity of the State would be diminished *unless* other trades worked longer hours to make good the deficiency. The fight, then, would range not merely between the disaffected trade and the officials, but between the disaffected trade and the remaining divisions of industry which were threatened with longer working hours plus the officials.

Similarly in the case of individuals. If any one person were dissatisfied with, for instance, the house allotted to him, although, so far as he was concerned, his quarrel would be with the officials, he would find himself opposed, rather than supported, by the rest of the community. For, according to M. Leroy-Beaulieu, as the State will be the sole owner of all forms of accommodation, no one could, without first obtaining State permission, change his quarters.

The unfortunate individual desiring change would, however, be powerless, for the reason that he would have to fight his battle practically single-handed. Were he to have a better house it could only be at the cost of some other member of the community, and we may be sure that the community would not assist him on such terms. In the same way with employment; once in a certain trade, however distasteful, there could be small hope of change.

Thus in the Socialist State there would be no power on the part of the individual to rise above his existing condition. Further, Socialism would, in practice, involve the reintroduction of the old form of serfdom known as "*glebæ ascripti*."

"How will the individual worker fare if he is dissatisfied with his treatment?" To this question Mr. Herbert Spencer replies, "This dissatisfied unit

in the immense machine will be told he must submit or go. The mildest penalty for disobedience will be industrial excommunication."[1] This, in the case of International Socialism, would be equivalent to nothing less than compulsory starvation.

"Already on the Continent," wrote Mr. Herbert Spencer some few years ago, "where governmental organisations are more elaborate and coercive than here, there are chronic complaints of the tyranny of bureaucracies, the *hauteur* and brutality of their members. What will these become when not only the more public actions of citizens are controlled, but there is added this far more extensive control of all their respective daily duties? What will happen when the various divisions of this vast army of officials, united by interests common to officialism —the interests of the regulators versus those of the regulated—have at their command whatever force is needful to suppress insubordination and act as 'saviours of society'?"[2]

The dangers which attach to the creation of an official bureaucracy of such vast dimensions as Socialism must necessitate, are forcibly put forward by the late John Stuart Mill in his work *On Liberty* in the following words:—

"Every function superadded to those already exercised by the Government causes its influence over hopes and fears to be more widely diffused, and converts, more and more, the active and ambitious part of the public into hangers-on of the Government, or of some party which aims at becoming the

[1] *A Plea for Liberty*, Introduction, p. 19.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

Government. . . . If the employees of all these different enterprises were appointed and paid by the Government, and looked to the Government for every rise in life, not all the freedom of the Press, and popular constitution of the legislature, would make this, or any other country, free, otherwise than in name. . . . To be admitted into the ranks of this bureaucracy, and, when admitted, to rise therein, would be the sole objects of ambition. Under this *régime*, not only is the outside public ill-qualified, for want of practical experience, to criticise or check the mode of operation of the bureaucracy, but even if the accidents of despotic or the natural working of popular institutions occasionally raise to the summit a ruler, or rulers, of reforming inclinations, no reform can be effected which is contrary to the interest of the bureaucracy. Such is the melancholy condition of the Russian Empire, as shown in the accounts of those who have had sufficient opportunity of observation. The Czar himself is powerless against the bureaucratic body."[1]

In view of the foregoing it is clear that, so far from class distinctions being abolished under Socialism, they will be perpetuated in a new and far more oppressive form.

Perhaps, in the earlier stages of Socialism, the new slavery may be tolerated by that portion of the servient class who were whole-hearted Socialists. These might take the view that although the new *régime* was producing results quite unanticipated by them, yet, in time, the trouble would be set right. But what of the large minority who had Socialism

[1] Mill, *On Liberty*, pp. 65, 66, 1887 edition.

imposed on them against their will? These men, having no faith in Socialism at all, would only see in the preliminary breakdown the first-fruits of the disasters which they had all along confidently anticipated. They certainly would be unwilling to wait until the condition of the country and the circumstances of the workers had gone from bad to worse.

What facilities would be accorded to them for the expression of their views? The Socialists hold that a man has no right to his property. They go even much further, and assert that "Just as no man can have a right to the land, because no man makes the land, so no man has a right to his self, because he did not make that self."[1]

It follows as a certainty that persons holding views such as these, if once placed in power, would, in order to maintain themselves in power, have no hesitation whatsoever in sustaining, and if need be by force, that no man has a right to his opinions, and that all opposition to their rule must be summarily crushed. The official class, we may be certain, would strenuously resist anything that threatened their ascendency.

"Socialists," writes Professor Karl Pearson, "have to inculcate that spirit which would give *offenders against the State short shrift and the nearest lamp-post.* Every citizen must learn to say with Louis XIV.: *'L'État, c'est moi.'*"[2]

In commenting on the foregoing statement of Professor Pearson, Professor Flint remarks: "Contemporary Socialism desires to serve itself heir to the

[1] Mr. Robert Blatchford in *Merrie England*, p. 75.
[2] *Ethics of Free-thought*, p. 324.

absolutism of past ages. Its spirit is identical with that of all despotisms. It seeks to deify itself, and means to brook no resistance to its will. The Socialist in saying *'L'État, c'est moi'* will only give expression to the thought which animated the first tyrant."[1]

On the same point we have striking corroboration from Mr. Belfort Bax, who has written: "The Socialist has a distinct aim in view. If he can carry the initial stages towards its realisation by means of the count-of-heads majority, by all means let him do so. If, on the other hand, he sees the possibility of carrying a salient portion of his programme by trampling on this majority, by all means let him do this also."[2]

If, as here indicated, there is to be a servient class and a dominant class, it really is immaterial whether a member of the servient class belong to the minority or to the majority. The only people who will count at all are the officials. If the will of the majority be acceptable to the officials—well and good. If this be not the case, the majority is to be over-ruled. To find confirmation of this from a Socialist source it is only necessary to turn to the writings of Mr. Belfort Bax.

"The only public opinion, the only will of the majority, which has any sort of claim on the recognition of the Socialist in the present day, is," writes Mr. Bax, "that of the majority of those who have like aspirations with him . . . in other words, the will of the majority of the European Socialist party."[3]

[1] *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, p. 335.
[2] *Ethics of Socialism*, pp. 127, 128.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 122.

Surely the evidence already cited proves conclusively that, in order to concede a wholly imaginary and quite impossible Equality, Socialism must make devastating inroads upon personal Liberty. "Equal —but slaves" would be an infinitely more distasteful condition than that of being "Free, if Unequal." Equality, however, is impossible of attainment. As President Butler of Columbia University writes: "Nature knows no such thing as Equality. . . . Destroy inequality of talent and capacity, and life, as we know it, stops. . . . The corner-stone of Democracy is natural inequality; its ideal the selection of the most fit. Liberty is far more precious than Equality, and the two are mutually destructive."[1]

Was Equality, as Socialists allege, the rule of society in primitive times? Unquestionably No. Such an idea was too transparently false to be even put forward. Each tribe existed surrounded by enemies. Persons, therefore, of necessity grouped themselves for defence and attack round the strongest and the most intelligent.[2]

In advocating equality of condition the Socialist has recourse to the history of a past which never in fact existed. The main ideas are for the most part borrowed from Rousseau.

"All men are equal by nature and before the law."

"Nothing," rightly observes M. Émile Faguet, "is more false than the *first* portion of this formula."[3]

If under Socialism Equality is to be maintained,

[1] *True and False Democracy*, by President Butler, pp. 56, 57.
[2] See *Le Socialisme en* 1907, p. 116, by M. Faguet.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

individuality must necessarily be ruthlessly suppressed.

As the late poet laureate wrote :—

"Envy wears the mask of love, and, laughing sober fact to scorn,
Cries to weakest as to strongest, 'Ye are equals, equal-born.'
Equal-born? Oh yes, if yonder hill be level with the flat.
Charm us, Orator, till the Lion look no larger than the Cat.
. . . . . ."[1]

It has already dawned upon many of the industrial working-classes how great is the probability of a tyrannical exercise of power under Socialism. The overbearing conduct of the leaders of those of the trades-unions now in the grip of Socialism excites periodical comments and protests in our daily press ; and similar protests are not wanting on the Continent, as well as in Great Britain.

The programme of the French *Syndicalisme jaune*, a trade-unionist organisation advocating co-operation and opposed to State intervention, as drawn up at the Congress of 1904, comprised (*inter alia*) the following—namely, their determination to "struggle against State Collectivism, which, in subordinating the workers to the State, would place them *in the grip of an anonymous monster irresponsible and harsher than any private employer*."[2]

The Socialist writer, Mr. Spargo, is right when he states : "There is no such thing as an 'automatic democracy,' and eternal vigilance will be the price of liberty under Socialism as it has ever been."[3]

In seeking to estimate the resistance which the

[1] Tennyson's *Locksley Hall, Sixty Years After.*
[2] Quoted on p. 303 of *Le Collectivism en* 1907, by M. Émile Faguet.
[3] *Socialism*, by Mr. John Spargo, p. 217, published in 1906.

servient class would be able to offer to officialism, a grave error will be committed if it be imagined that any of the weapons by which majorities can at present enforce their demands, or by which minorities can secure protection, would be available under the altered conditions of Socialism. The present-day means of associated action would be entirely destroyed. The printing press and the newspaper are now the essentials of organised opposition. The literature of a movement, the printed aims and objects, the circulars —all of these are the indispensable means of associated action.

Under Socialism the State would control not only all the printing presses, but the newspapers as well. The only use to which the officials would allow this machinery to be put would be in support of those existing conditions which were vital, in point of their continuance, to the officials themselves. No books or pamphlets would be permitted to be printed which were opposed in view to the official interest. The newspapers would be written by officials and edited by officials. So far as non-official movements were concerned, it would be just as if there were no newspapers at all.

Individual members of the State would, of course, be powerless to change this. Even if the whole of some great city, such as Leeds, met together and resolved: "We WILL have our own paper," what would be gained? All the means of production would be in the hands of the State, *i.e.* the officials, and there would be no money in private hands with which to buy plant for printing purposes, and no plant in the market for sale. The extermination of the press

as we know it to-day, as a channel of expression of views and a rallying ground against injustice, would in itself paralyse any movement involved in a simultaneous concerted action over an extended area. If to the sterilisation of the press there were added, as quite easily there might be, a censorship of the Post Office, popular opposition to official rule could never have the advantage of a national movement.

The press is to-day one of the great safeguards of minorities. It will be obvious, that the suppression of it as a means of public expression of views would do much to render impregnable the tenure of office by any Government which held it in its absolute control. Socialism, with its partisan censorship of all that is printed, threatens a tyranny of thought in the name of Freedom, which in these days should alone go far to secure its overthrow at the hands of those who trouble to realise the tyranny which Socialism would in practice involve.

Equality of Reward

Assuming that Socialism is established ; that the land and all the means of production, distribution, and exchange have been socialised ; that everything belongs to the State, and that capital and the means of producing capital cease to be in private hands—what is to happen ? Everybody of appropriate years is to work, but how are they to receive the fruits of their labour ?

There are three possible methods of division.

1. To each according to his deserving—that is,

that an attempt should be made to yield to each worker the proceeds of his own labour.

2. An equal division irrespective of needs or earnings.

3. That each should receive according to his needs, and, consequently, receive more or less, as the case might be, than he had actually produced himself.

In the selection of the method of distribution an eye must be kept on a dreaded second and privileged class. If the workers, for instance, are to receive individually what they really do earn, there will be an immediate resuscitation of competition. Furthermore, there would once again be instant disparity. Possibly, seeing that all would be under the necessity of working or starving, there would be little, if any, actual need, assuming that the State regulation of all industry were, in fact, to prove practicable. Yet, beyond doubt, some would only just be able to sustain life while the skilful and industrious might enjoy comparative comfort. Within a very short time there would, however, exist a privileged class, which would not only be the envy of those—the officials apart—who did not belong to it, but would be a standing condemnation of the failure of Socialism to abolish class distinctions and to establish Equality.

If, under Socialism, persons are to be paid according to the nature of their production, capitalism, in the sense of class distinctions, will again be restored, since the skilled workman will be an aristocrat, and his influence throughout exceed that of the ordinary workman.

If, on the other hand, each is to be paid merely according to a given amount of work, not only will

encouragement to the exercise of ability, brain-power, and skill cease, but again capitalism, in the sense of one possessing advantages not possessed by another, will be re-established.

This result will necessarily ensue from the fact that the physically stronger workman will be required to expend, for example, only half the effort of the weaker in order to receive the same degree of reward.

The formula, therefore, "To each according to his works," in whichever way it may be applied, promotes inequality and is the founder of privilege. To such an extent is it the equivalent of the system which at present exists that it can have *no* place in the Socialist *régime*.[1]

The Socialists themselves seem to recognise the weight of these conclusions, and consequently are not found, as a rule, to advocate the claim that each man should receive what he earned. If each man does NOT receive what he earns, the general total productivity of labour is bound, however, to be gravely diminished—seeing that personal incentive will be lost.

We come, then, to the second suggested method of distribution—that the product of labour should be divided equally, without regard to needs or actual earnings.

"Controversy," writes Mrs. Annie Besant, "will probably arise as to the division : shall all the shares be equal, or shall the workers receive in proportion to the supposed dignity or indignity of their work?

[1] See as to this *Le Socialisme en* 1907, by M. Émile Faguet, pp. 223-227. In his chapter entitled *Le Collectivisme*, M. Faguet develops these and other consequences with great force and power.

Inequality, however, *would be odious*. . . . The impossibility of estimating the separate value of each man's labour with any really valid result, the friction which would arise, the jealousies which would be provoked, the inevitable discontent, favouritism, and jobbery that would prevail: all these things will drive the Communal Council into the right path—*equal remuneration of all workers*." [1]

Another leading Socialist writer, Mr. Gronlund, in his *Co-operative Commonwealth* suggests: "Then, perhaps, as some Socialists now desire, the hod-carrier will receive as much for an hour's work as the university professor, although, be it remarked in passing, the difficulty of the professor's work is hardly comparable with that of the hod-carrier." [2]

From this parenthetical statement it would appear that in Mr. Gronlund's own opinion the manual worker should by right receive more, were it not for the fact that equality necessitates the payment of the same amount to mere mental effort!

". . . . Equality of remuneration," declares Mr. John Spargo, "is not an essential condition of the Socialist *régime*. . . . It may be freely admitted, however, that the ideal to be aimed at ultimately must be *approximate equality of income. Otherwise, class formations must take place and the old problems incidental to economic inequality reappear*." [3]

Then, on the other side, we find the following views put forward on behalf of Socialism. In the manifesto dated October 1, 1830, addressed to the

[1] *Fabian Essays*, pp. 163 and 164.
[2] P. 113.
[3] *Socialism*, p. 233. Published 1906.

French Chamber of Deputies, Bazard and Enfantin thus dealt with the doctrine of equal division of property: "The system of community of goods is always understood to mean equal division among all the members of society, either of the means of production or of the fruit of the labour of all. The Saint Simonists reject this equal division of property, which in their eyes would constitute *a greater violence, a more revolting injustice than the unequal division* which was originally effected by force of arms, by conquest. For *they believe in the natural inequality of men*, and regard this inequality as the very basis of association, as the indispensable condition of social order."[1]

The logic of this latter statement is difficult to refute. An equality of distribution would inevitably affect production, and most disastrously. Where, indeed, is the incentive for the skilful man, or the industrious, to put forth his best efforts, if the reward that he receives for his exertions is merely to equal that of the "work-shy," who, objecting to starve, is only just performing the necessary minimum requisite to qualify him for the supply of his needs? Indeed, it is easy to foresee that it will be made uncomfortable for the man who is so inconsiderate of the feelings of his fellows as to "set a good pace."

In combating the false doctrine of *laissez-faire*—"Every man for himself, and devil take the hindmost"—Socialism would thus go to the opposite extreme, and would seek to establish in its place the equally false doctrine of "Every man for his neighbour, and devil take the foremost."[2]

[1] Quoted in the appendix to Mr. Thomas Kirkup's *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 393.

[2] See *A Reply to Merrie England*, by "Nemo," p. 183.

Every student of naval warfare is aware that the speed of a fleet is no greater than the speed of the slowest vessel included in that fleet. Similarly in any State based on this idea of equality, progress in production will necessarily be regulated by the output of the least industrious and the least intelligent.

Socialism is surely, then, courting disaster in attempting to enforce an equality of possessions amidst an inequality of attainments and efforts. Under equal freedom this can never be secured. Socialism, therefore, has to build up a system of equal slavery.

Even in this endeavour Socialism must inevitably fail, because it is forced to recognise two different classes, *viz.:* (1) a class of officials; (2) a class of workers.

Therefore, if able to dispense with an inequality of wage (to which, in practice, it is more than doubtful that Socialism will be able to adhere), an inequality of class will still unquestionably remain. And if an inequality of wage were found to be essential to the maintenance of the necessary national productivity, there would instantly be *three* classes: *i.e.* (1) The official dominant class; (2) the privileged working class (probably extensively graded and subdivided); and (3) the lower manual-labouring class.

The only result that could reasonably be anticipated from a division on this principle is summed up by President Butler in these words: ". . . Justice involves liberty, and *liberty denies economic equality*, because equality of ability, of efficiency, and even of physical force, are unknown among men. To secure an equality which is other than the political equality incident to liberty, the more efficient must be shackled

that they may not outrun the less efficient, for there is no known device by which the less efficient can be spurred on to equal the accomplishments of the more efficient." [1]

As equal division is impracticable, and a distribution to each according to his earnings is dangerous, and from many standpoints distinctly non-Socialistic, it is inevitable that the Socialists will be driven back upon the last of the three possible schemes, and will decree that every worker shall receive "according to his needs." Indeed, this proposal is now submitted in the formula, "From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs."

That this will in all probability be the selected basis of distribution rests upon the fact, that it is the *only* scheme which neither produces a privileged class of skilled and industrious workers nor yet re-establishes capitalism. The latter contingency would inevitably be realised, in some form or another, if the earnings of one worker were greater than those of another.

For this principle there is this further to be said. It takes into account the actual inequalities of individual productiveness. The stronger man and the more skilful are recognised as facts which must be dealt with. The State, however, neutralises their natural advantages by demanding "from each according to his ability." The State thus averages productivity by annexing surplus product. Consequently, natural inequalities of production will be prevented from making for a disparity in distribution. Then, again, the weaker and less efficient producers are protected, in that the State out of its usurped

[1] *True and False Democracy*, by President Butler, p. 9.

bounty offers of its stolen charity "to each according to his needs."

Mr. H. M. Hyndman has developed this proposal in a letter which he contributed to *The Daily Telegraph* of October 14, 1907. In this letter Mr. Hyndman wrote:—

"Socialism will recognise no difference as to the share of the general product between the 'good' and the 'bad' workman, but will give both every opportunity to make themselves more valuable citizens and comrades. Good and bad will alike be doing their social best for the community, and will be entitled to their full participation in the enjoyment of the wealth created by the work of the whole body, which, with no more than the present power of man over nature, could, even to-day, be made as plentiful as water."

Unfortunately Mr. Hyndman and those who follow his lead beg the whole question. They arbitrarily assume that each really would give "according to his ability," although all that the individual would receive in return would be a supply "according to his needs." If such did not prove to be the case—if, in the absence of extra reward for extra exertion, the able men did not put forward their best efforts—there would of necessity be an instant diminution in the productivity of the community. If that became the case, wealth would certainly *not* "be made as plentiful as water," to use Mr. Hyndman's rhetorical phrase.

In another passage of the same letter Mr. Hyndman once more begs the question:—

"What can the good workman want beyond the

most satisfactory outlet for his highest capacity, complete comfort in all respects throughout his life, and no anxiety whatever as to the future of himself, his wife, or his children, in return for the pleasure of using to the best advantage his superior faculties for his own benefit and that of everybody else? So with the foreman, supposing that functionary to be necessary. The foreman, or villicus of the chattel-slave period, got a less ration than the slaves whose labour he 'organised,' on the express ground that his task was not nearly so exhausting as theirs. Under Socialism there will be no such discrimination against any possible 'foreman'; he, like the 'bad' workman, will get all he wants as a useful social unit. What more will he want?"

Seeing that Mr. Hyndman is merely here repeating what may be heard from every Socialist platform, it may be worth while to examine his point. The good workman desires a great deal more than "the most satisfactory outlet for his highest capacity." Work for work's sake is an ideal to which few can uplift themselves—especially when that work is arduous and of a character that offers no variation. The workman engages on his task for wages' sake, and will continue to do so until human nature ceases to be human nature. If, and whenever, he finds that the bad workman is in receipt of exactly the same reward that he receives, or even possibly more, the incentive for him to continue a good workman and to fully exert himself will disappear. Indeed, it is probable that he would not be allowed by his fellows to throw into prominence their own shortcomings, even if he himself desired so to do. Who is there who if he

were secure of "all he wants" by easy and indifferent workmanship, *and could get no super-added advantages by good workmanship*—who would persist for the rest of his working days in supplementing the deficiencies of the sluggards and laggards about him?

Mr. Hyndman once more begs the question when he assumes that under so chaotic a system of production there would be enough for the complete wants of every one. This is precisely what there would not be. Destroy individual competition; obliterate personal incentive; guarantee to sloth and incapacity a certain means of livelihood, and there remains only machinery which is wanting in all the driving power and springs of action.

True democracy, again states President Butler of Columbia University, "will exactly reverse the Socialist formula, 'From each according to his abilities; to each according to his needs,' and will uphold the principle, 'From each according to his needs; to each according to his abilities.' It will take care to provide such a ladder of education and opportunity that the humblest may rise to the very top, if he is capable and worthy."[1]

Yet, this grotesque proposal "From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs" is the most practical solution of the division of labour product which the Socialists are at present able to offer!

Equality of Opportunity

If a dominant class and a servient class are inevitable under Socialism (and it would be impossible

[1] *True and False Democracy*, pp. 13, 14.

to prove the contrary), then in the new State there will be no Equality in point of class. Similarly, unless, wholly irrespective of the quality and worth of service, there is identity of reward—the Premier receiving precisely the same payment as the lamplighter—there will be a further failure in the promised Equality. Increased pay would result in improved circumstances, and in the formation of a privileged class within a class, and before very long in the creation of a new class entirely.

Driven from point to point, the Socialist none the less rallies his dupes with the proclamation of yet another kind of Equality—"The Equality of Opportunity." It will be shown that this last promise is every whit as delusive as the previous promises which Socialism puts forward.

In dealing with existing inequalities, Socialists invariably select the extremes. One would imagine from their speeches that we lived in a world in which there were a few millionaire dukes at the top, some millions of starving toilers at the bottom, and no grades in between.

Here, for instance, we have this fanciful sketch from Mrs. Annie Besant.

The destruction of the small industries, Mrs. Besant asserts, "has left in their place a gulf across which a few capitalists and a huge and hungry proletariat face each other."[1]

The truth, of course, is that, "If there is anything that can be called a social gulf, it is the interval," as states Mr. Stanley Robertson, "which separates the steady and well-paid workers from the loafers and

[1] *Fabian Essays*, p. 151.

the criminals ; and that gulf is quite as much moral as it is economic."[1]

Then, again, "General" Booth of the Salvation Army, with his almost unique knowledge of the poorer classes in this country, has declared it impossible to mix the people who come to him for shelter, and that there are apparently as many classes in his shelters as outside. Yet the Socialist none the less ventures to classify all these as *one* class under the name "Proletariat," in entire disregard of the existing facts.

Consequently, we have at the start a glimpse of the countless existing grades for all of whom this Equality of Opportunity must somehow be provided. Nor are the differences confined merely to social status and material circumstances : they are also of a moral, physical, and intellectual character.

The matter resolves itself into a handicap, in which the less favoured, owing to nature, character, or circumstance, are to run side by side on terms of an equal chance with the more favoured. How is this to be done? Weight cannot be taken off the less fit. Socialism cannot make weaklings strong, or dull brains intelligent, or "work-shies" diligent. No—this motley mob of the unfit can only run their race on level terms if more weight is put on the best. In this case every quality which has hitherto been prized, and earnestly and laboriously developed, will prove to be an actual incubus, marking the possessor down for oppressive treatment.

There is another possible way in which matters may be arranged. The course may be so short and

[1] Mr. E. S. Robertson, *A Plea for Liberty*, p. 34.

easy and the race may be run so slowly that good and bad may all be together in a bunch at the finish. And if, after all, the prize is scarcely worth the having, and is, at best, merely the barest necessities of life, secured to every starter who somehow "gets the course," the pace is not likely to be very rapid.

The vital fact stands clear and is unanswerable. One can only place those who are handicapped by nature, on terms of equality with their more favoured competitors by means of "levelling down" the naturally strong and able.

Under this head of Equality of Opportunity there is much to be said for the Socialist demand of equality of life chance. The figures as to infant mortality prove that the poor man's child has even to-day less chance of living than has the child of the rich man. Again, there is a clearly proven link between over-crowding and a high death-rate. These grave matters are, however, not an indictment of the present system of society *per se*, although they undoubtedly do rise in condemnation against those who allow them to continue. Similarly with regard to deaths in the workhouses, this could be corrected by sympathetic legislation from within the Constitution. The facts in question may constitute a strong case for Old Age Pensions. No Socialist could show that they evidenced some point of necessity which was beyond the reach and attainment of the present system of society.

Again, most of us undoubtedly sympathise with the Socialist demand for equality of educational advantages; although never less than at the present time was there sound ground for outcry on this

score. Lord Curzon, the Chancellor of Oxford University, only voiced popular feeling when in addressing the workmen at Ruskin College on November 11, 1907, he said: "He looked with sympathy upon their work at Ruskin College, and he would like to open wide the doors of the University to the working classes and the democracy. . . . Do not let them have the idea that the University was an association of rich men who looked upon them with suspicion. He believed that the best thought and opinion in the University welcomed their arrival to Oxford."[1]

The more education is extended, the greater must necessarily, however, be the degrees of Inequality, owing to the varying grades of ability which individuals possess. Surely, then, it is idle for Socialism to promise "*Equality of Opportunity*," if no one is eventually to be permitted to take advantage of his opportunity?

"It may be freely admitted," writes Mr. Spargo, "that the ideal to be aimed at, ultimately (under Socialism), must be approximate equality of income; otherwise, class formations must take place and the old problems incidental to economic inequality reappear."[2]

The truth of the latter part of this statement may be frankly admitted. For the State to place the means within a person's reach to surpass his less industrious companions, and then to step in and to compulsorily deprive him of what should in justice be the fruits of his labour, is *not* to confer a benefit,

[1] See *The Morning Post*, November 12, 1907.
[2] *Socialism*, p. 233.

but to impose an injustice. Yet such must invariably be the action of the State under Socialism, unless it is voluntarily and passively to permit the undermining of its very basis.

Experience, as Mr. W. H. Mallock rightly enforces, proves that Equality of Opportunity, instead of tending to render the power of all men equal, serves but to emphasise the profound extent to which they differ.[1]

It is even totally untrue to say that Equality of Opportunity is essential in order that ability may achieve conspicuous success. Countless examples of this fact can be quoted. In this connection Mr. Mallock directs attention to the fact that the greatest inventors in this country during the nineteenth century had no advantages of educational opportunity whatsoever—in fact, that, as recorded by Dr. Smiles, our greatest mechanical inventors had not even the advantage of being educated as engineers. In short, that none had any special educational opportunities whatsoever. Such instances, as Mr. Mallock observes, go to prove that ability, "far from being the *creature* of opportunity," is, on the contrary, in most cases "the *creator* of opportunity."[2]

Professor Lecky is a valuable witness on the same point:—

"The true source of the enormous disparities of condition," states Professor Lecky, "lies in the great natural inequality of men, both moral and intellectual and physical, and in the desire of each man to improve his position."[3]

[1] See *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, p. 210.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 210–211.
[3] *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 317.

The cause of *true* democracy requires that these qualities should be given every scope for development. To all such development Socialism would prove hostile in the extreme.

In dealing with the demand for "Equality of Opportunity" it is necessary briefly to record the facts of life which the Socialists have in mind. Most of them are, of course, manual or clerical workers. Year in and year out they rise early and go to work. They are already tired in body when they are at last free to enjoy such recreations as their tastes, means, and surroundings offer. They realise that after a long life of toil they will be fortunate if they have been able to set aside anything approaching an adequate provision for the years when work is no longer possible. They know, too, that ill-health or lack of employment will in many cases find them unprotected.

Their circumstances, when compared with the far happier condition of others, din into their minds that there must be something radically wrong with a world which provides, or at all events permits of, such a diversity of fortune. They know that the vast majority of themselves will be unable to materially improve their position. Indeed, they believe that only a few have the qualities that befit a higher station. Each man, of course, counts himself amongst those few.

Many of them devote what leisure they can command to reading. With their mental improvement there naturally comes a craving for improved surroundings. Students of Darwin and Sir Oliver Lodge do not find, however, that their value to their

employers has been enhanced. These men discover, in fact, that their reading has fomented a discontent, but has failed to carry them higher in the scale. When, then, the individualist appears and assures them that ability carves its own way, they regard his words as being a personal aspersion upon themselves. When, again, the same Job's comforter turns to the grand instances of workmen who have risen, success is in all such cases attributed to some sort of good luck through the agency of which the fortunate few were enabled to break through the mesh of environment. When, for instance, Mr. John Burns became a Cabinet Minister every Socialist stump orator began to violently asperse their whilom idol. The preferment which had been denied to them was on his side.

Of course, the factor which is so often overlooked is force of character. Mere ability is nothing compared with it. Any artificial scheme of Equality of Opportunity will always be defied by it. Mr. John Burns has enjoyed no greater advantages than those that are open to millions of men in this country to-day. He has achieved a brilliant success, while Poplars and West Hams attest the insufficiencies of less worthy aspirants.

As President Butler accurately asserts: "We must put behind us the fundamental fallacy that equality is demanded by justice. The contrary is the case. Justice demands inequality as a condition of liberty and as a means of rewarding each according to his merits and deserts."[1]

[1] *True and False Democracy*, p. 15.

VIII

THE SOCIALIST THEORY OF MANAGEMENT

THE variety and immensity of the services which would devolve upon the Socialist State—and which would comprise the complete control of all the industries and of all the workers in the land—lift the question of Management under Socialism in point of importance into the very forefront.

Quite recently a leading American Socialist, Mr. John Spargo, has summarised what, in his opinion, is the prevalent Socialist conception at the present time as regards this important point.

"Boards of experts, chosen by Civil Service methods, directing all the economic activities of the State, such is their" (*i.e.* of most Socialist writers) "general conception of the industrial democracy of the Socialist *régime*. They believe, in other words, that the methods now employed by the Capitalist State, and by individuals within the Capitalist State, would simply be extended under the Socialist *régime*."[1]

The methods would, very possibly, be largely those of the present system—as Mr. Spargo here states—but there would be at least one important variation.

[1] *Socialism*, by Mr. John Spargo, published 1906, p. 225.

Take any huge industrial undertaking of our time that suggests itself, and one finds that the paramount controlling power centres in some single individual. General Managers, for instance, very largely control the great railway system. The Boards are to a great extent dependent upon them. The Managers must powerfully influence the concern, either beneficially or otherwise. Indeed, in great industrial concerns a committee-rule is to a large degree impossible. There is not the time for the discussion at Board meetings of any but the most important questions of policy. The administrative strings are to a great extent in one man's grasp, and alike for reasons of continuity of purpose and swiftness of action it is essential that they should be so.

More especially is this probably the case in regard to productive, as contra-distinguished from distributive, undertakings. How are we to come by these strenuous personalities under Socialism? Will men of ability habitually consent to work long hours merely to receive the bare necessities of life? Even if such a man of ability were available, would his Committee give him that free scope and independence which are essential to the play of his fullest powers?

"... The competitive system," writes Mr. Kirkup, "has been a process of selection, bringing to the front, as leaders of industry and also as heads of society, *the fittest men*."[1]

How can the same result be effected under Socialism?

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 299.

The Relations between Managers and Employees under Socialism

A further important and essential point which requires consideration is as to what shall be the relations existing between the managers and officials, on the one hand, and the employees, on the other. Is the servant, in effect, to control the master? Or is the manager and official to be wholly independent of those who are to work under their control?

This is one of the many Gordian knots with which the Socialist must deal.

To quote again from the Socialist writer Mr. Spargo: "It is perfectly clear that if the industrial organisation under Socialism is to be such, that the workers employed in any industry have no more voice in its management than the postal employees in this country" (*i.e.* the U.S.A.) "have at the present time, it cannot be otherwise than absurd to speak of it as an industrial democracy."[1]

Essential Need for a Firm Basis of Authority

If all is to be *directly* controlled by the State, as the fundamental principles of Socialism require, it becomes a matter of primary importance that, in the industrial interests of the community, the governing power should undergo as infrequent change as possible.

[1] *Socialism*, by Mr. John Spargo, p. 225.

Socialism, therefore, as Dr. Schäffle and other distinguished critics have laid stress upon, essentially demands an *autocratic* government, "and *not* one that may start up in one week, ready made from out the masses of the electors, only to be sacrificed to this Moloch again the next."[1]

Such changes of government would of necessity be accompanied by *overwhelming* dangers "in a State so much in need of a basis of authority" as is the Socialist State.[2] This imperative need for a firm basis of authority accordingly renders the Socialist State "less fitted than any other kind of State" to maintain a purely democratic system of popular representation.[3]

Socialism dare not, however, to-day, in its quest for supporters, admit these facts. Were it to do so, Socialism would be straightway forced to disavow the promises of "Freedom" and "Absolute Equality," which it so extravagantly lavishes. These in the eyes of most of its supporters rank amongst the foremost inducements which Socialism is able to offer.

On one or other of these two rocks Socialism, if put into practice, must inevitably go to pieces.

". . . What is impossible," to quote again from Dr. Schäffle, "for all time is an improvised democratic and exclusively Collective production *without firm hands to govern it*, and without immediate individual responsibility or material interests on the part of the participators, which is what the Collectivists desire, and what alone can tickle the

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, by Dr. Schäffle, translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 125.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 128.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 130.

fancy of that Individualism of the proletariat whose watchwords are Freedom and Equality."[1]

Absence of Incentive to Economical Working

Meantime, another serious impediment bars the possibility of a successful industrial consummation under Socialism. This is no other than an absence of all incentive to economical working.

Few serious thinkers will probably care to challenge the conclusion arrived at by Dr. Schäffle, that if Collectivism as a whole should prove a much less economical system than Capitalism, "Labour" would not only have gained nothing, but "might even fall into a much worse case than before."[2]

That such would be the inevitable consequence was in principle admitted by one who will for all time rank amongst the greatest leaders of International Socialism. Ferdinand Lassalle, the great German Socialist, expressly conceded that no system of production which did not increase production could be justified on economic grounds, "because an *increase of production is an indispensable condition of every improvement of our social state.*"[3]

In attempting to reply to this point, Socialists claim that, seeing that everything would belong to everybody, all would in reality be working to benefit themselves. Consequently it would become every worker's care to prevent wastage and to secure

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bosanquet, pp. 37 and 38.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 53.
[3] Quoted in Mr. Rae's *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 123.

economical working. The Socialists even go further and turn to those industrial concerns which are at present conducted on profit-sharing lines. In reference to these, Socialists are correct in claiming that a financial interest in the undertaking has resulted in increased watchfulness and activity on the part of the workers.

The vast distinction between a profit-sharing interest in one particular undertaking and a fractional interest, running into millions, in the sum total of the whole industry of the State is self-evident. The interest of the profit-sharers is under their personal control—to the extent that a share in the product of their increased activity comes to them and goes to no other workers than themselves. Similarly, the losses incident to bad workmanship are directly sustained by them, and are not merged in the general industry of the whole country.

Under Socialism no such proximate interest would exist. A worker who was not specially moved to do his best might say, "What does it matter? There are at least ten or fifteen million others working for the State and for me. If I do slack off this month, how can it possibly affect the total national output?"

If such a feeling became widespread—which is more than probable, human nature being what it is—a material decline would result in the total national income.

If this were the case with the workers, what could be expected from the officials?

"What interest," asks M. Émile Faguet, "would all these bureaucrats have in strict economy?" The same authority also holds that, "owing to the very

hugeness of the machine, the officials would escape from all individual responsibility." [1]

Mr. W. H. Mallock, in his masterly analysis entitled *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, emphasises the all-important fact that, were the exercise of ability to be seriously interfered with—for example, by depriving it of all profits—the effect upon the national income must necessarily be disastrous. Mr. Mallock further shows that the two chief existing factors in the production of the national income are *not* Labour and Capital—meaning thereby living labour, on the one hand, and dead material on the other—but that they consist of two distinct bodies of living men. On the one hand, labourers ; on the other, men of ability, whether of a creative or directive nature.[2]

Defects Inherent to State Management

Another important defect is inherent by nature in the Socialistic form of management. "No owner," as Mr. Thomas Mackay states, "will agree to acknowledge the deteriorated value of his plant unless he is obliged to do so. Hence Government monopolies are very slow to adopt improvements. Each official is unwilling to admit the weaknesses of his own system, nor will he readily disendow his own knowledge and labour by accepting improvements which will oblige him to acquire fresh knowledge, and which will render his present services antiquated." [3]

[1] *Le Socialisme en* 1907, p. 211.
[2] See *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, pp. 238 and 239.
[3] "Investment," by Mr. Thomas Mackay. Published in *A Plea for Liberty*, p. 236.

Socialism, since it proposes to transform all branches of industry into State monopolies, will, as a consequence, render these grave imperfections all-pervading.

Mr. Rae thus effectively sums up the defects of State administration under the present industrial system. "It has," he says, "one great natural defect—its want of a personal stake in the produce of the business it conducts, its want of that keen check on waste, and that pushing incentive to exertion which private undertakings enjoy in the eye and energy of the master. This is the great tap-root from which all the usual faults of Government management spring—its routine, red-tape spirit, its sluggishness in noting changes in the market, in adapting itself to changes in the public taste, and in introducing improved methods of production." Hence it is that the proverbial result is "an unprogressive, unenterprising, uninventive administration of business."[1]

If such form some of the adverse features which characterise State administration under the present industrial system, *each and all would be accentuated under the Socialist régime*. At the present time the State is enabled to secure the assistance of ability by the payment of relatively high salaries to its head officials. In the Socialist State the doctrine of "Equality" would totally preclude the State from paying to the managers a salary even remotely corresponding to their vast responsibilities.

Even if in practice the Socialist State were enabled to differentiate on a large scale in the matter of salaries, &c., *if the reward is to be limited to the form of*

[1] *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 409.

mere necessaries, the stimulus to the exercise of ability would in a large degree still be lacking. Socialism, consequently, expects from the controllers of industry a standard of life closely approaching Spartan simplicity, coupled with the exercise of more than Spartan virtues.[1]

Amongst the foremost of these latter qualities would have to be included a willingness to work and to fully exert themselves, actuated thereto by no other incentive for the most part than that which the sentiment of public benevolence might provide.

Dr. Schäffle in this way tersely sums up the practical thinker's indictment of Socialism, on these counts: "So long as men are not incipient angels . . . democratic Collective production can never make good its promises, because it will not tolerate the methods of reward and punishment for the achievements of individuals and of groups, which under its system would need to be specially and peculiarly strong." [2]

The Socialist Argument of the Post Office

"The postal and telegraphic service," affirms Mr. Robert Blatchford, "is the standing proof of the capacity of the State to manage the public business with economy and success. . . . Socialists declare that as the State carries the people's letters and telegrams more cheaply and more efficiently than they were carried by private enterprise, so it could

[1] *Cf.* Professor Graham's *Socialism, New and Old*, p. 167.
[2] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 74.

grow corn and weave cloth and work the railway systems more cheaply and more efficiently than they are now worked by private enterprise." [1]

Mr. Blatchford is an adept at begging the question. He has excelled himself in this quotation. Where, we would ask, is the evidence that "the State carries the people's letters and telegrams more cheaply and more efficiently than they were carried by private enterprise?" Such a test can only be made if the State's zealously guarded monopoly be broken down, and private enterprise were accepted in competition on terms of equality under present-day conditions.

Again, according to Mr. Bernard Shaw, "the extraordinary success of the Post Office" has, we are told, "not only shown the perfect efficiency of State enterprise when the officials are made responsible to the class interested in its success, but had also proved the enormous convenience and cheapness of Socialistic or Collectivist charges over those of private enterprise." [2]

In one most important respect the Post Office evidences *not* the success of State management, but, on the contrary, one of its inherent weaknesses, namely, the inadaptability to change.

The whole history of the Post Office in this country constitutes a standing proof of the fact that reforms have not emanated from the Post Office itself, but have invariably been forced upon it *by the public*. Reforms have generally been carried into effect only after years of popular agitation.

[1] *Merrie England*, pp. 100 and 101.
[2] *Fabian Essays*, p. 185.

Further, the fact that the Post Office is most carefully guarded by legislation against all outside competition is in itself a tacit admission of its inability to successfully compete against private enterprise.

The ordinary public, as a rule, has been too prone to consider that the comparatively insignificant sum represented, for example, by a charge on an ordinary letter of 2½d. from the United Kingdom to some part of the British Empire, necessarily denoted the lowest possible cost of carriage.

The fallacy of such a hasty conclusion is now shown by the ability on the part of the Post Office to reduce the cost in most cases to 1d. per half-oz. Still more recently (*i.e.* in 1907) it has been found possible to reduce the postal rate from the United Kingdom to Canada to 1d. *per oz.*, as against the 2½d. *per half-oz.* charged some few years back.

If the State has been able to earn a profit on the carriage of letters, this has been very largely due to overcharging. Against the charges made by the Post Office the public have, for the most part, not troubled to agitate, chiefly owing to ignorance of the true facts.

In connection with the telegraphs no such profit has been earned by the State. On the contrary, over a series of years the financial losses attending the working of this department have been such as would long ere this have landed a private company in bankruptcy.

The arrangement whereby in past years the Post Office has been accustomed to make good the loss on telegrams out of its profits in connection with the carriage of letters is, as has been frequently

emphasised, the really Socialistic feature attaching to the Post Office.

The fact that, even to-day, *private enterprise is an all-important contributor to such success as is attained by the Post Office,* is overlooked by those who forget that the mails are carried both by railways and by ships which are *not* State-owned, but worked entirely, so far as the United Kingdom is concerned, by private enterprise. Complaints are rife from time to time that the Government sweats these mail steamship companies, and, whether that be so or not, the cost of carriage would be enormously enhanced were the State to be the national letter-carrier from start to finish.

One shudders to think what would happen were the railways — which once again represent private enterprise — to cease to be the inland carriers. Beyond all question their prompt deliveries contribute largely to the discharge of postal work throughout the United Kingdom. Indeed, the moment that the Post Office is left to its own resources, we find inefficiency. The Christmas breakdowns are proverbial, and yet the Post Office should have learnt by this time what the strain is which they will be called upon at this period to meet.

Nor does the State appear very favourably as a model employer. Trouble amongst postal employees is of frequent occurrence. Favouritism is something more than a suspicion, and promotion by no means attends always on merit.

Mr. D. J. Shackleton, the well-known Labour M.P., speaking on October 5, 1907, at Briercliffe, said: ". . . The Government were the largest firm of

employers in the land, and they had quite as many complaints from their employees as the private firms. . . ."[1]

The attitude of the State in this country towards the telephone when first invented, and attempted to be introduced into England, was one of relentless opposition.

Owing to the fear that the use of the telephone would injure its telegraphic monopoly, the Post Office at first both declined itself to make use of the new invention or to permit private enterprise to do so. This opposition on the part of the State, as represented by the Post Office, was eventually only overcome through the medium of a strong popular agitation.

The action of the Post Office in this case furnishes a striking example of the opposition likely to be encountered, under Socialism, by new inventions which tend to detract from the value of existing inventions which are already the property of the State.

The result of such State opposition to the telephone has been, that for many years the commercial cities of Great Britain were years behind those of many Continental countries in the use of the telephone.

Now that the use of the telephone in matters of business has in Great Britain become general, and even indispensable, it is possible for the business man to appreciate to some extent the loss which this country has in consequence for many years suffered.

[1] *The Nelson Leader*, October 11, 1907.

At the present time, when the telephone service is being worked by the Post Office as well as by private enterprise, no general evidence is forthcoming to prove the superiority of the former in this respect over the latter.

Even were we, however, to concede that the State management of the Post Office leaves nothing to be desired, what does that prove?

The Post Office is a highly-graded service with varying rates of remuneration, determined by the positions held by each individual. Promotion is the basis of the service, and promotion invariably carries with it higher rates of pay. If the chief of the electricians received just the same pay as the humblest of the letter-sorters, and none the less continued to exert himself to his utmost capacity, then, if such conditions prevailed, the Post Office would undoubtedly be a valuable witness to the practicability of Socialism.

Nothing of the kind is the case, however, at the present time. Therefore to attempt to foist a strongly individualistic concern upon the public as an illustration of the practicability of Socialism should deceive no one.

"From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs"—when the Post Office employees are one and all remunerated on that basis, then, and *not* till then, will the Post Office be of value as evidence of the practicability of Socialism.

IX

SOCIALIST FALLACIES

ANSWERS TO SOME OF THE STOCK ARGUMENTS AND ASSERTIONS

The National Income—Who Gets It?

One of the favourite platform tricks of the Socialist is to draw an exaggerated picture of present-day conditions, and then to highly colour it and exclaim, "Socialism is the only hope, the only remedy!"

The allegation is that "the rich are growing richer and the poor are becoming poorer." The assertion is made with the view of serving a double purpose. It is sought both to impress the manual workers with the belief that their position is desperate, and, at the same time, to convince the middle classes that they also are being crowded out. The allegation takes several forms, but we give two of them.

Mr. F. A. Sorge, in *Socialism and the Worker*, writes as follows: "More and more this middle class cease to be property-holders; it is getting more and more difficult for the mechanics and small farmers to hold their ground; thus the middle class is constantly decreasing, the class of wage-labourers increasing, until there will be only two classes of people—rich and

poor. In this process the number of rich people is diminishing, *wealth becoming concentrated in the hands of comparatively few persons, who are getting enormously rich.*" [1]

Mr. H. M. Hyndman, in a series of letters entitled *Scientific Socialism*, voices the same allegation when he states that "the gradations between the two" classes (*i.e.* the rich and the poor) "are being gradually crushed out." [2]

In short, the Socialist averment is that it is now practically impossible for any man in this country to better his station in life, no matter how great may be his zeal, ability, and perseverance. So far from this in reality being the case, the main social feature of the nineteenth century in Great Britain was the rise of the middle classes.[3]

There are varying estimates of the national income of this country. Sir R. Giffen, in a paper published in the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* (vol. lxvi., part iii., 1903), fixed the amount at £1,750,000,000.

Mr. Bowley, an expert of high credentials, gave it as £1,800,000,000 in the *Economic Journal* for September 1904.

The Socialists' friend, Mr. Chiozza Money, M.P., estimated it at £1,710,000,000 in respect of the year 1904, in his book *Riches and Poverty*.

We may take it, accordingly, that £1,800,000,000 is a fair working figure.

When, however, we attempt to divide this total up amongst the community, we are met with insuperable

[1] Published by the Twentieth Century Press, p. 12.

[2] Quoted by Mr. Mallock in *Property and Progress*, p. 172.

[3] See Mr. Mallock's conclusive refutation of this Socialist assertion, *Ibid.*, pp. 173–212.

difficulties. Mr. Chiozza Money, however, has faced these difficulties with a light heart, and it is to his efforts that the Socialists are indebted for their fanciful figures. The real value of Mr. Money's work in this direction may perhaps be measured by the variety of his own conclusions.

Mr. Money gave evidence before Sir Charles Dilke's Committee on the Income Tax, and on May 23, 1906, Mr. Money handed in the following statement:[1]—

INCOME OF THE UNITED KINGDOM IN 1904

Distribution as between (1) those with £700 per annum and upwards; (2) those with £160 to £700 per annum; and (3) those with less than £160 per annum.

	Number	Income
(*a*) Persons with incomes of £700 per annum and upwards and their families (275,000 × 5) . . .	1,375,000	£585,000,000
(*b*) Persons with incomes between £160 and £700 per annum and their families (750,000 × 5) . . .	3,750,000	245,000,000
(*c*) Persons with incomes of less than £160 per annum and their families	37,875,000	880,000,000
Total . .	43,000,000	£1,710,000,000

After an interval, however, of only one week, Mr. Money found it to be necessary to change his views. In consequence, on May 30, 1906, he handed in the following amended statement:[2]—

[1] See Report of the Income Tax Committee, No. 365, of 1906, p. 39.
[2] See Report as above, p. 61.

INCOME OF THE UNITED KINGDOM IN 1904
(Question 542)

Distribution as between (1) those with £700 per annum and upwards; (2) those with £160 to £700 per annum; and (3) those with less than £160 per annum.

	Number	Income
(*a*) Persons with incomes of £700 per annum and their families (275,000 × 5)	1,375,000	£542,000,000
(*b*) Persons with incomes between £160 and £700 per annum and their families (800,000 × 5) . . .	4,000,000	288,000,000
(*c*) Persons with incomes of less than £160 per annum and their families	37,625,000	880,000,000
Total . .	43,000,000	£1,710,000,000

Mr. Money's most recent manipulation of these figures is to be found in *The Daily Mail Year-Book* for the year 1908. In this appears an article by him entitled "An Estimate of British Wealth: The Inequality of its Distribution," on p. 6 and the following pages. This article is daringly summarised in a diagram facing the first page of printed matter, as follows:—

"THE COUNTRY'S INCOME
WHO GETS IT?

£600,000,000 A YEAR TAKEN BY ABOUT
1,250,000 PEOPLE.

£250,000,000 A YEAR TAKEN BY ABOUT
3,750,000 PEOPLE.

£900,000,000 A YEAR TAKEN BY ABOUT
39,000,000 PEOPLE.

"The aggregate income of the 44,000,000 British people in 1907 amounted to about £1,750,000,000. About £600,000,000 was taken by about 1,250,000 well-to-do and rich men, women, and children; about £250,000,000 was taken by about 3,750,000 men, women, and children of the middle classes; about £900,000,000 was taken by about 39,000,000 men, women, and children of the lower, middle, and working classes. Further explanation is given in an estimate of 'British Wealth,' pp. 6–8."

There is no mystery about these totals. A School Board child might compile them. You have one figure to work upon, and that is the aggregate national income, which is "estimated" at £1,750,000,000. The next step is to "estimate" the share of the income-tax payers and to ascertain their number. Then deduct from the total the amount which you claim is the share of the income-tax payers, and the balance is the pittance which falls to the millions who do not pay income tax. Then, of course, you may slightly inflate the income-tax total and give point to your diagram.

For instance, the diagram claims that there are 5,000,000 people only who are interested in income tax—that is, 1,000,000 persons, including their families. We know that the "estimated population" of the United Kingdom for 1907 is roughly 44,000,000, so the diagram-maker hastens to announce that the little which the income-tax payers do not take is divided amongst the 39,000,000 who do not pay the tax.

On p. 8 of Mr. Money's article in *The Daily Mail*

Year-Book this gentleman himself admits that the income-tax payers represent "about 5,000,000 to 5,500,000 men, women, and children." Thus, on Mr. Money's own showing, the 39,000,000 total should be reduced to 38,500,000.

On the same page (viz. p. 8) we are met with another wild statement. "Therefore, about 5,000,000 people, or say one-ninth of the entire population, enjoy roughly one-half of the entire national income."

But Mr. Money is himself a witness to the contrary: 5,500,000 persons form *exactly one-eighth* part of the 44,000,000 who make up the population of this country, and *not* one-ninth. The £850,000,000, which Mr. Money asserts they take, is considerably less than one-half of the total national income, which is estimated by reliable authorities at not less than £1,800,000,000.

But how were the figures arrived at?

Mr. Money distributes the national income with a fine air of authority. It is an amazing thing, therefore, to find that his totals are wholly unprovable and are merely hypothetical.

The evidence of Sir Henry Primrose, K.C.B., the late Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue, as recorded before the Committee on the Income Tax (No. 365 of 1906), should be read carefully by those who seek to follow up this issue further.

Dealing with the incomes below £700, Sir Henry Primrose admitted that in many cases "there is a certain amount of income on which we receive tax which we ought not to tax." (See Answer to Question 36.)

The unreliability of these income-tax assessments

will be clear, however, the instant it is known that the basis on which the claim is founded is by acting upon the arbitrary, and in many, if not most, cases wholly unjustifiable assumption that a man's income is rather more than ten times the amount of his rent if he live in London, and sixteen times more than his rent if he happens to live in the country.

Mr. Money does not hesitate for a moment to give us the figures of the larger incomes. Sir Henry Primrose, however, with his unique knowledge of the question, gave evidence as follows:—

In answer to a question "as to the aggregate amount of income of persons with incomes of £5000 per annum or more," Sir Henry replied: "It is a most perplexing and baffling question. I have really spent a great deal of time in attempting to investigate it, and I have finally come to the conclusion that almost the only basis upon which you can go from our statistics is the House Duty; *it is very imperfect*, but still, as far as it goes, it is a guide." (See Answer 38.)

Mr. Arthur Lyon Bowley, who is, of course, the well-known expert, a Lecturer of the London School of Economics and a Member of the Council of the Statistical Society, gave Mr. Money's figures their final *congé*.

Asked by the Committee, "Do you find that it is possible to estimate fairly closely the distribution of national income here?" Mr. Bowley replied, "No, I am not at all satisfied that it is possible to estimate it with any reasonable exactitude." (See Question 1159.)

In reply to Question 1162, the same important

witness gave in detail his reasons for his conclusion that the evidence was not sufficiently good to make any accurate estimate; and also stated that "the number of income-tax payers with incomes below £700 is at present a matter of estimate—a rather vague estimate. . . ."

Here, therefore, the matter stands. There are not in existence the statistical data to enable any one to distribute with a reasonable degree of accuracy the national income amongst the various classes of the community. Even the aggregate amount of the national income is unknown, and so distinguished an authority as Sir Henry Primrose can only speak as follows: "I do not attach very great importance to the calculations, but it is supposed that the total income of the country is somewhere between £1,600,000,000 and £1,800,000,000." (Question 194.)

Mr. Money has none of the hesitancy which is felt by the late Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue. Not only does Mr. Money assert that he can succeed where Sir Henry Primrose restrains himself, and give a definite figure, namely, £175,000,000; but Mr. Money goes further and divides up that amount amongst the community.

In view of the true facts, we submit that the public will be wise in regarding Mr. Money's figures as being hypothetical and unproven; if, indeed, they are not absolutely negligible quantities.

"Labour" not the Sole Source of Wealth

Mr. Money has rivals in his figure creations, and the effort of the Fabian Society, as set forth in

Fabian Tract, No. 5, is deserving of notice. It should be realised, of course, that the use to which these fancy tables are put is to convince the worker that he is most unjustly treated, and that capital takes an inequitable share of general production.

"No wealth whatever can be produced without labour," wrote Professor Fawcett in his *Manual of Political Economy* (page 13), and this, indeed, is a truism which has been stated by Adam Smith and other economists of note. None of these authorities, however, can have imagined that the weight of their names would be used in support of the assertion that *manual* labour is the sole source of all wealth. This is, however, what the Socialists are preaching from every platform to-day.

They first fix the total national income, and, out of a widely differing range of estimates, accept a figure of £1,800,000,000. Then from every platform they bewail that capital, representing the few, receives upwards of two-thirds of the whole total, while labour is compelled to be satisfied with one-third.

Hear what Mr. Blatchford writes on page 13 of *Britain for the British*: "Roughly, then, two-thirds of the national wealth goes to five millions of persons, quite half of whom are idle, and one-third is *shared* by seven times as many people, nearly half of whom are workers."

It will be remembered that even Mr. Money concedes that the workers receive one-half of the national income.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain takes the same position as Mr. Blatchford. From page 7 of their manifesto, dated May 14, 1907, we take the

following: "Of the wealth produced in this country, roughly £1,700,000,000 per annum, the workers' share is, according to capitalistic authorities, less than £665,000,000, so that the working-class gets little more than a third of the wealth produced. Wealth is natural material converted by labour-power to man's use, and as such is consequently produced by the working-class alone. . . ."

Now, we feel sure that none will find difficulty in showing that the whole of the wealth of the country is *not* produced "by the working-class alone." One might as well argue that an engine is self-sufficing, and needs neither working capital in the form of coal, nor ability in the shape of a driver.

The Socialist under pressure reluctantly admits this. He clings, however, to his beloved cry that the worker only receives one-third of the national income, and hastens to assure you that the wages of ability are included in the one-third. He usually backs up the statement by alleging that the one-third and two-third figures are not his, but that they are the work of Sir Robert Giffen.

Now it is possible to refute his statement as to Sir Robert Giffen, and, once and for all, to kill that one-third cry by quoting Fabian Tract, No. 5.

This Tract should be most carefully studied. It estimates the national income and the class shares of that income, and actually bases its conclusions on the work of Sir Robert Giffen and that of other statisticians. The point that we wish to make at the moment is this: this Tract, on page 9, expressly states that this figure of £690,000,000 is the income of the "*manual-labour* class" alone.

Further, the authors set out another figure, which, on page 7, they describe as the "rent of ability," and on page 9 as "profits and salaries."

This total is stated at £460,000,000, and our point is that the amount is earned, and that the labour, which the earnings represent, has played a great part in the production of the income of the country.

The Fabian figures on this matter seem to be accepted by Socialists of all denominations, and so it is well worth while examining them.

The table is set out on page 9 of the Fabian Tract, No. 5, as follows:—

Rent	£290,000,000
Interest	360,000,000
Profits and salaries	460,000,000
Total (that is, the income of the legal proprietors of the three natural monopolies of land, capital, and ability)	1,110,000,000
Income of manual-labour class	690,000,000
Total produce	£1,800,000,000

The first move of the platform Socialist is to gravely inform us that no wealth is produced except by labour; then "manual-labour" is glorified, and is solemnly put up to take the credit of the product of all forms of labour; then "manual" labour's total of £690,000,000 is found to be, roughly, one-third of the total national income; and then "manual" *is dropped entirely out of the labour picture*, and the crowds are told that labour, which alone produces wealth, gets only a third, and the "idle rich" take the rest.

Now, to make these figures tell an even approximately truthful story, the table should be arranged as follows :—

Rent	£290,000,000
Interest	360,000,000
Total	£650,000,000
Earned by labour—	
By purely manual labour	690,000,000
Labour (other than manual)	460,000,000
Total of national income directly paid to labour	£1,150,000,000

These figures show that instead of that notorious one-third only going to labour, labour directly receives, roughly, two-thirds of the national income.

Are the Rich growing Richer and the Poor Poorer?

On page 112 of his recently-published book, *From Serfdom to Socialism*, Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P., quotes some figures which Mr. Sidney Webb published in *Industrial Democracy*. We give the quotation: "At the beginning of the last century the whole value of the land and capital of England is estimated to have amounted to less than £500,000,000 sterling; now it is supposed to be over £9,000,000,000, an increase eighteen-fold. Two hundred years ago rent and interest cannot have amounted to £30,000,000 sterling annually; now they absorb over £450,000,000."

These figures, of course, prove nothing more than that this country has shared in the great industrial development which has been taking place throughout

the civilised world. Yet from countless platforms they are quoted and re-quoted by Socialists for the purpose of "proving" that the rich are getting richer and the poor are growing poorer.

While we do not for a moment wish to suggest that the conditions of the workers are not capable of much improvement, it will be generally conceded that considerable progress has been made in that direction in this country, more especially in the last half-century. Wages have been increased, and in numerous ways the lot of the manual workers has been improved. It is not, of course, within our province in the present work to bring under review any of the numerous ameliorative proposals. Indeed, all proposals of this character are contemptuously rejected by thorough-going Socialists as at best being only palliatives.

It should be recognised at once that the Socialists do not seek to win for "Labour" a larger share of the product of Industry, &c., but they will be content with *nothing less than the whole*. This is their chief bait: "Vote Socialist, and we will give you the whole product of your labour. We will eliminate the capitalistic deductions on the score of Rent and Interest."

The Socialists may occasionally allege that the share of "Labour" has *not* increased proportionately with the increase in capital, but in this contention they are met with the difficulty of finding figures in support of their allegation. Therefore they take up the bolder position, and urge that capital in private hands should be wholly abolished.

As an invitation and an incitement to the public

to join in this crusade against capital, the Socialist assures his audience that capital is getting out of hand, and that self-preservation finds its only chance in Socialism.

Most Socialists, following on their leader Marx, still point to the present large system of production, with its vast capital amounts, as part of the historical evolution which must inevitably before very long bring about the inception of the Socialist State.

In so doing they totally ignore the fact that the growth of the joint-stock principle tends *not* to the elimination, but to the multiplication of the small capitalist; and, as such, represents a movement *away from*, and *not* towards, the social revolution pictured by Karl Marx.

The truth of our contention is well instanced in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. This company in the early future will own and control in Canada, approximately, 13,000 miles of railway. It possesses, also, one of the largest share capitals of any railway company in the world.

At the meeting of this company, held on October 2, 1907, the president of the company (Sir Thomas G. Shaughnessy, K.C.V.O.) announced: "I might mention that when the books closed for the October dividend, there were 11,203 ordinary shareholders whose respective holdings were fifty shares or less, and from information received through banking and security organisations, whose own certificates are outstanding against stock held in trust for clients, I estimate that there are 3000 other investors of the same class,

making in all upwards of 14,000 *people whose individual holdings do not exceed fifty shares.* Hence it would appear that *practically one-third of your entire ordinary share capital is held by these small investors.*"[1]

Of the whole capital as much as 70 per cent. is now held in the United Kingdom (*i.e.* nearly three-fourths).

A leading mistake into which Socialists habitually fall is, observes Professor Graham,[2] that "the increasing concentration of capital, which is an undoubted fact, is an increasing concentration or accumulation in ever fewer hands."

This, states Professor Graham, was one of the fundamental fallacies of Karl Marx, and has been endorsed by both Professor Cairnes and by Professor Fawcett, and lies at the root of all their desires to change the present industrial organisation, by substituting for it Universal Collectivism, as advocated by Marx, or Co-operative Production, as advocated by the other two.

"If," writes a prominent Socialist, Mr. John Spargo, "as some writers, notably Bernstein, the Socialist, have argued, the concentration of capital and industry really leads to the decentralisation of wealth and the diffusion of the advantages of concentration among the great mass of the people, *then*, instead of creating a class of expropriators, ever becoming less numerous, and a class of proletarians, ever growing in numbers, *the tendency of modern capitalism is to distribute the gains of industry over a widening area—a process of democratisation, in fact.*"[3]

[1] See the Company's Official Report, p. 6.
[2] *Socialism, New and Old*, p. 403.
[3] *Socialism*, p. 114. Published 1906.

We have no wish to disguise the fact that Mr. Spargo himself here argues against this deduction; but the fact remains, as he himself admits, that leading Socialists have of late years accepted this doctrine as true.

Even more instructive is the following statement by the English Socialist writer and historian, Mr. Thomas Kirkup.

"We believe also that Marx made a serious mistake," writes Mr. Kirkup, "in holding that the further development of capitalism will be marked by the growing 'wretchedness, oppression, slavery, degeneracy, and exploitation'[1] of the working-class. *Facts and reasonable expectations combine clearly to indicate that the democracy . . . is marked* by a growing intellectual, moral, and political capacity, and *by an increasing freedom and prosperity. . . .*"[2]

If, in addition to this testimony, the evidence of a statistician of the highest standing be needed, it is forthcoming in the statement of Sir Henry Primrose, the late chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue, who, in giving evidence before Sir Charles Dilke's Income Tax Committee, stated: "I think the real characteristic of the distribution of wealth in this country is the very large number of people moderately, but not extremely, rich—that is to say, the large class of people with incomes of from £1000 to £5000 a year is rather a marked feature of this country."[3]

Socialists dilate at length on the extent to which the large retail stores are crushing out the small

[1] Marx's *Kapital*, p. 790.
[2] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 386.
[3] Report No. 365 of 1906. Answer to Question No. 65.

private shopkeeper, &c. What, however, is the Socialist "remedy"? In the Socialist State *all* industries are to be converted into State monopolies.

The Socialist policy, therefore, must inevitably crush out *all* retail dealers, &c. In the place of *each* individual trade is to be substituted one gigantic and all-embracing State monopoly. In short, the Socialists propose to "remedy" the evils and grievances upon which they descant by not merely amputating the member which is the cause of the trouble, but by so operating on the patient himself as to cause instantaneous death.

Those to whose grievances the Socialists appeal should, *before* extending their support to Socialism, consider what it is that Socialism proposes to effect. Let them first carefully ascertain whether the new *régime* will rectify their grievances or aggravate them. Such a course of action is necessary in countless cases besides the present instance.

Even when the Socialist correctly states his premises, he is none the less apt to attempt to mislead his audiences in regard to the conclusion.

In this connection Mr. Thomas Mackay in the passage following disposes of a favourite fallacy which Socialists constantly seek to foist upon their would-be converts:—

"It is true that private enterprise shows a disposition to organise itself on a large scale by means of trusts and other combinations, but this new departure has been preceded by a great Specialisation and subdivision of energy, and forms *no* precedent

for the establishment of a great monopoly *per saltum*"[1] (*i.e.* at one spring).

The extent to which what were previously individual undertakings have been distributed amongst all classes of the people, through the agency of the Companies Acts, is made clear by the following table :[2]—

Year.	Number of Companies on the Register.	Paid-up Capital.
		£ (millions).
April 30, 1887 . .	10,494	591
„ 1897 . .	23,728	1,285
„ 1907 . .	43,038	2,061

" . . . The few cannot be rich without making the many poor," writes Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P.[3]

The foregoing statement is one echoed daily by Socialists.

Its truth is abundantly disproved by the case of the United States of America. This is the country in which wages stand the highest, and which, at the same time, by common acceptation, possesses the greatest number of millionaires.

The Trade Unionists' Report of the "Mosely Industrial Commission," issued in 1903, and later statistics touching the conditions of the industrial working classes in the United States, all go to prove how totally unfounded is this assumption on the part of Socialists.

[1] "Investment," by Mr. Thomas Mackay. Published in *A Plea for Liberty*, p. 241.

[2] Based on the Annual Returns of the Board of Trade, and quoted in *The Economist* of August 3, 1907.

[3] *The Socialist's Budget*, p. 8.

The latest report, for example, at the date of writing, of the British Commercial Agent in the United States[1] states that the wages paid to railway men and workers in manufacturing and industrial establishments in 1905 showed "a gain of 57 per cent. since 1900," and "that wages in 1906 were still higher than 1905. . . ."

On this head, too, we have a striking admission made by Mr. Robert Blatchford, who has written :—

"It is instructive to notice that our most dangerous rival is America, *where wages are higher and all the conditions of the worker better than in this country.*"[2]

It must not be assumed that we endorse all the deductions which may be drawn from this wide statement on the part of Mr. Blatchford. We quote it chiefly as an instance of how one Socialist leader will frequently build up an assumption on a basis which is flatly contraverted by another Socialist leader of equal, if not greater, importance than the former.

The Unemployed

The unemployed form one of the stock-in-trades of the Socialist orator. In the absence of any reliable statistical information as to their numbers, Socialist figures take a wide and daring range.

"Are you aware that one in every sixteen of the workers is to-day without a job?" is a question in frequent use by Socialists.

The questioner might just as well have put the

[1] Cd. 3283–137, July 1907, p. 4.
[2] *Britain for the British*, p. 107.

figure at one in every five. There would have been just as much—or just as little—evidence in support of the latter estimate as there is in aid of the former. The one way in which all such questions should be met is by a demand for the authority on which they are based.

There are two existing channels of information, and both of them are defective. The one is furnished by the returns made by the Trade Unions to the Government; and the other is provided by the returns made under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, by the various Distress Committees.

The Trade Union returns are wholly unreliable, for the double reason that not only do the unions themselves incorporate only a proportion of the workers of the country, but, in addition, only a proportion of the unions make any employment returns at all. In September 1907, 273 Trade Unions, with a membership of 631,241, made returns out of a possible 1161 Trade Unions with a membership of 2,106,283.[1] The unemployment in these 273 Trade Unions was in September 1907 4.6 per hundred, as compared with 3.8 in September 1906. These figures are, however, utterly valueless for the purpose of definitely estimating the general unemployment throughout the country.

Equally uninforming are the returns made by the Distress Committees under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905. The following table is given on

[1] These represent "the number of Trade Unions known by the (Labour) Department to be in existence" at the end of the year 1906, together with their membership. See *The Labour Gazette*, December 1907. These totals are only computed annually.

page clxxix. of the Report of the Local Government Board, 1906–7 (Cd. 3665 of 1907).

	Six months, ended March 1906.	Year ended March 1907.
Total number of applicants . . .	110,835	87,001
Number of applicants found qualified for assistance under the Act . . .	73,817	60,416
Number of dependants of these applicants	199,965	152,801
Number of applicants provided with work	41,321	36,280
Number of persons (including dependants) assisted to emigrate	678	4,532.

The following are some of the official remarks which accompany this table, and they are to be found on the same page of the Report of the Local Government Board, 1906–7 :—

"It will be noticed that the total number of applications to distress committees during the year ended March 1907, was considerably less than the number received in the course of the previous six months. Many of the applications registered during the year ended March 1907, also, were not fresh cases, but renewals of applications on the part of persons who had applied to the distress committees before the end of March 1906. The number of fresh applications during the year 1906–7 was, in fact, only 61,897."

On page clxxx. of the same Report we find this significant statement :—

"The want of employment indicated by the returns received by us affected chiefly the class described as general or casual labourers, and men connected with the building trade. The former, both in the period ended March 1906, and in the year ended March

1907, counted for more than 50 per cent. of the applicants whose applications were entertained."

In view, then, of the complete absence of reliable data which covers the whole field of unemployment, the figures of Socialists must be rejected, and the real reason for such rejection should be made known to the audience.

That there is a considerable amount of unemployment in the United Kingdom is a regrettable fact. Politicians of all views, however, would be able to frame remedial measures for the improvement of our trading and industrial conditions from within the Constitution. No case whatever has been made out of the existence of a plight so desperate as would justify the total overthrow of the system which has obtained for long centuries, in favour of some other scheme the working details of which have not even been vouchsafed to the public.

Pauperism

The Socialist, in his desire to draw the sorriest picture of life under society as at present established, relies largely upon pauperism. Thus we are constantly met with assertions from Socialists like the following: "In London one person out of every four will die in a workhouse, hospital, or lunatic asylum."[1]

Or again: "In London in 1904 one person in every three died in the workhouse, hospital, or lunatic asylum."[2]

[1] See *Britain for the British*, p. 15.
[2] See *Fabian Tract*, No. 5, p. 13.

The variations which these assertions take with the vast numbers of Socialist speakers are bewildering. As a rule, the hospital and lunatic asylum totals are left wholly out of the statement, and the public are, as often as not, informed that the statistics show that in England and Wales one person out of every four dies in the workhouse.

A few moments' thought should satisfy most persons that the hospital and asylum contributions should be omitted from this total. Sickness and lunacy are not misfortunes which fall upon any one section of the community exclusively. Nor are they the special features of life under any particular economic system. Even if Socialism were established to-morrow, there is no valid reason whatsoever for supposing that we should not have just as many who were on the sick list, and who were mentally unfit, as exist to-day.

Probably, too, we should have an army of malingerers in addition. It is certain that for centuries to come—whatever our economic system may be—we shall have a large number of the physically unfit.

For these, amongst other reasons, both fairness and the desire to arrive at the real truth demand that we should eliminate all totals except that of deaths in the workhouse. This will be unfortunate for this Socialist contention, for the reason that the deaths in hospital—in London, at any rate—nearly equal those in the workhouse. The figures for the year 1905 were as follows:[1]—

Deaths in the workhouse in London, 13,985.

Deaths in hospitals in London, 10,854.

[1] See the Registrar-General's Report for 1905, Cd. 3279 of 1907, p. 202.

But surely there is another point of just criticism. On what grounds can it be justified that the London figures should be set out separately from those for the rest of England and Wales?

One can only obtain an accurate view of the condition of a country by considering the data for the whole of that country. And, indeed, there are special reasons why the London figures should not be accepted as being an index to the condition of the country as a whole. To a large extent London is the place to which great numbers of those who have failed elsewhere invariably drift. Further, there is congregated in the metropolis a large and poor alien population which accentuates the struggle of the native-born.

Then, again, in London: "The cost per head of indoor paupers has been from 48 to 53 per cent. more than in unions not in London. . . . As already suggested, this result is to a considerable extent to be attributed to the improved accommodation provided for the poor in the metropolis, including that provided by the managers of the Metropolitan Asylum district."[1]

This fact, taken in conjunction with the Poplar and other disclosures, suggests the probability that the increased attractiveness has appealed successfully to a considerable section of the more worthless members of the community.

The wide divergence in the figures showing the deaths in the workhouses in London, when compared with those in the rest of England and Wales, of itself proves that there is considerable weight in

[1] See Local Government Board Report, 1906–7, p. cl.

these objections as regards accepting the London figures separately. The totals are as follows :—

During 1905 the proportion to the total deaths in England and Wales borne by the deaths in the workhouses was 9.38 per cent. ; whereas the similar proportion in London alone was 19.07 per cent.[1]

We do not, of course, defend this result. The state of affairs which it discloses provides an opportunity for statesmen. It is not, however, within our present province to suggest remedies. The inherent sadness of these figures apart, there is lacking any evidence of the alarming increase which alone would justify the proposals of violent change—even were they proved to be practicable and beneficial—which are advanced by the Socialists.

It is for Socialism not merely to call attention to the disease, but to produce some evidence that the adoption of the new scheme would tend to diminish, and not to aggravate, these evils. (See as to this the chapter on "Progress or Reaction?" pp. 167–195.)

On the Verge of Starvation

"Twelve millions of our people are on the verge of starvation."

No Socialist speech in this country seems to be considered as being complete without that assertion. And, more often than not, the figure is inflated to thirteen millions. This remarkable allegation is founded, or alleged so to be, upon a statement which was made by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, M.P., at Perth on June 5, 1903.

[1] See the Registrar-General's Report for 1905, p. 201 and following pages.

The exact passage in the speech reads: "In this country we know, thanks to the patient and accurate scientific investigations of Mr. Rowntree and Mr. Charles Booth, that there is about 30 per cent. of our population underfed on the verge of hunger. Thirty per cent. of 41,000,000 comes to something over 12,000,000."[1]

Thanks to the investigations of Mr. Rowntree and Mr. Charles Booth! Mr. Rowntree's investigations were *exclusively* confined to the city of York, the population of which, according to the 1901 Census, was less than 78,000. Nothing, therefore, which Mr. Rowntree accumulated would enable Mr. Rowntree, or any one else, to form an "accurate scientific" estimate for the rest of the United Kingdom outside York. So Mr. Rowntree and his work must, in this connection, be rejected.

Then we come to the work of Mr. Charles Booth. This gentleman, similarly, only made inquiry into conditions in London. Did Mr. Booth's labours justify the conclusion at which the Premier arrived? In a letter which appeared in *The Daily Mail*, July 22, 1903, Mr. Booth wrote as follows:—

"In your leading article of Saturday you say 'The conclusion of Mr. Charles Booth that twelve millions of our people are on the verge of starvation, is entitled to the respect, &c.'

"Will you allow me to point out that I have never myself spoken of 'twelve millions,' or used the expression 'on the verge of starvation'? The

[1] *The Daily News*, June 6, 1903.

statement you quote is a deduction made by others from what I have written.

"My own work has been confined to London, where I count thirty per cent. of the population as living 'in poverty.' Mr. Rowntree showed a similar proportion for York, and the same rule may apply elsewhere. Hence the twelve millions.

"What I meant by 'poverty' I have tried to express in my book. It presses upon these people from various causes and in many ways, but they cannot correctly be said to be 'on the verge of starvation,' for they do not as a rule lack food, though they are often pinched in that, as well as in other respects."

Dr. Shadwell, in his most instructive work entitled *Industrial Efficiency*, repeatedly emphasises how fallacious it is to generalise for a whole country from the conditions prevailing in the capital.

In reference to London, Dr. Shadwell states: "*The great mistake* that strangers make in every country is to generalise from too small an experience, and in particular *to judge the rest from the capital.* Capitals vary; some are much more representative than others, but *it is never safe to take features observed in the capital as typical of the rest, and sometimes it is wholly misleading. . . . Neither does London represent the United Kingdom,* much less the British Empire. *It does not even represent England. . . . The conditions that occur in London are not found in any other English town. Nowhere are there such vast areas of grimy squalor.* . . . Above all other distinctive features, London is an *omnium gatherum* that has no rival. It is the only capital that is at once the seat of government and

of justice, the residence of the Court, the head-quarters of all the institutions of State and of the Church, *a great port*, a great manufacturing place, the centre of intelligence, the centre of trade and finance, the centre of crime and vice, the centre of fashion and pleasure. All roads lead to London, and everybody comes there ; it is the goal of ambition and *the refuge of the outcast*. No one can judge England without London ; *but let no one judge England from it*, and, least of all, the large industrial towns of the North." [1]

[*N.B.*—The foregoing conclusions of Dr. Shadwell, it should be carefully noted, *apply* not merely to the immediate subject with which we are now dealing, but *with equal force to various other sections* in the present chapter, &c. Elsewhere Dr. Shadwell emphasises that poverty and unemployment are always more pronounced in the case of cities *which are ports*, owing to the concentration of *unskilled and casual labour* which results.

As will be constantly found, Socialists naturally delight in basing their deductions solely on London, in order to provide the darkest picture possible of general conditions.]

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman has on his own behalf admitted that he was under a misapprehension as to the facts in making the foregoing deductions.

" Mr. R. A. Leach, Clerk to the Rochdale Board of Guardians," states *The Morning Post* of March 29, 1906, " recently asked the Prime Minister how he arrived at his estimate that twelve million people in this country were on the verge of starvation, and

[1] *Industrial Efficiency*, vol. i. pp. 55–58.

what was implied by that phrase. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman has now replied through his private secretary to the effect that he did not use the phrase, 'on the verge of starvation,' but that he spoke of twelve million people being 'on the verge of hunger,' *supposing that the figures of Charles Booth in the case of London and those of Rowntree in that of York applied to the whole country.*"

The admission is rather tardy, and might well be more explicit. Cabinet and ex-Cabinet Ministers naturally, however, do *not* care to acknowledge their *ex cathedrâ* utterances as fallible.

Infant Mortality

Extraordinary figures are flung from Socialist platforms with regard to child-life in the slums. The usual assertion is that the poor man's child has only one-fifth the life-chance of the rich man's child.

Mr. Robert Blatchford is ever prominent in daring sensationalism, and is responsible for the following contribution to the infantile death-rate controversy: ". . . Whilst the infantile death-rate among the well-to-do classes is such that only 8 children die in the first year of life out of 100 born, as many as 30 per cent. succumb at that age among the children of the poor in some districts of our large cities." [1]

We should greatly like to know in what districts this 30 per cent. total is to be found. If any such rate of mortality exists, Mr. Blatchford should at once correct the statistics of the Registrar-General.

The tables of the Registrar-General show that out of every 1000 born in England and Wales for

[1] *Britain for the British*, p. 15.

the period 1895-1900, 844 survived their first year. This table gives a percentage of mortality in the first year of 15.6 per cent. for the whole country.[1]

Further, if reference be made to p. xlv. of the same Report, it will be found that the town which has the highest death-rate for children under one year of age shows a percentage of 22.8 per cent., and not that sensational 30 per cent.

In *Britain for the British*,[2] Mr. Blatchford further announces that "Dr. Playfair says that among the upper class 18 per cent. of the children die before they reach five years of age; of the tradesman class 36 per cent., and of the working class 55 per cent. of the children die before they reach five years of age."

We are able, however, to trace these figures to their source. They are quoted by Mulhall in his *Dictionary of Statistics* (with acknowledgment to Sir Lyon Playfair). In that work they appear in the following form:[3]—

"The following table is from Sir Lyon Playfair and the Swedish returns, showing how many of 1000 infants born in each class will survive to complete their fifth year.

Condition	England	Sweden	Medium
Rich . .	820	750	785
Middle Class .	640	630	635
Poor . .	450	560	505"

[1] See p. xlvi. of the Registrar-General's Report, 1905.
[2] P. 15.
[3] Mulhall's *Dictionary of Statistics*, 4th edition, revised, p. 178.

This table, it will be seen, gives the 18 per cent., 36 per cent., and 55 per cent. totals.

It will be observed also that no date accompanies this table ; and, indeed, it appeared in the 1899 edition of the same work, and may be much older than that. Nor have we any information as to how the figures were arrived at. They were, however, not derived from an official investigation. Even assuming for the moment their correctness, they neither show that such deaths were in any way traceable to the present economic system, nor that Socialism would in practice tend to diminish the total.

One may search the Registrar-General's Report *without* discovering any official data which would enable any one to state how many rich men's children died, and at what age, and what was the proportion of such deaths to that borne by the children of the poor. Indeed, we have to go back twenty-three years, *i.e.* to the year 1884, for the *last* official estimates on this head. And even the extremest figures given for that year do *not* support the calculations of Dr. Playfair.

It would be grievously unfair, however, to lay the onus of a high infant mortality on an economic system. For instance, the Registrar-General directs attention to the point that there are many factors which contribute to infant mortality. High temperature and deficient rainfall are alluded to on page xlii. of the Report, the character of the locality on page xliii., the employment of the mothers on page xlvii. ; while on page xlix. occurs the following: "Another factor to be taken into account in

comparing the mortality of infants in the two groups of towns is the greater prevalence of illegitimacy in places where a large proportion of women are industrially occupied, it being well known that the rate of mortality among illegitimate children is considerably greater than among the legitimate."

Two points stand out :—

(1) There are in existence no reliable data of an official character which justify a speaker in the assertion that the percentage of deaths among poor men's children is heavier than it is with the well-to-do. Any figures quoted on this head are out of date, non-official, if not also unreliable.

(2) We have it on the authority of the Registrar-General that one of the great contributing factors to infant mortality is climatic. Even the Socialists have not as yet promised us an improved climate.

There remains only one other passage in the Registrar-General's Report which it is necessary to quote, if only for the reason that the Socialists invariably omit it. "Infantile Mortality—The deaths of infants under one year of age were in the proportion of 128 per thousand births in the year under notice" (*i.e.* 1905), "as compared with 145 in the year immediately preceding, and 150 the mean proportion in the ten years, 1895–1904. *The proportion in the year* 1905 *is the lowest hitherto recorded*" (see page xlii.).

It is undeniable, therefore, that the rate of mortality is *on the decrease.* What evidence is there that under Socialism this decrease would be accelerated or even continue ?

"Wage Slaves"

This is a catchy, telling taunt that is doing great service for Socialism. It is to be heard from every platform. Anti-Socialists can score heavily over it, and with a little trouble should make their opponents sorry that they ever thought of it. The idea conveyed by the phrase is that under Socialism men would no longer work for a wage, and that with the abolition of the present employing class each man would become his own master. The sublime theory underlying the taunt is that, when under Socialism all the means of production would be the collective property of everybody, everybody would be working for himself.

To-day a man works for reward, which, under the operation of the Truck Acts, is paid in cash. When he gets his money he is his own master in the spending of it. If he is fortunate and thrifty he may save, and (*a*) start for himself and be his own master, or (*b*) invest his savings, and by the help of his interest shorten or lighten his working years.

Under Socialism he would still work for reward. He would be none the less a wage earner, for the simple fact that he exchanged a labour cheque for such value in kind as it represented. His purchases would, however, be confined to what the State produced. His range of purchase would be sternly restricted.

No workman, however able, would be allowed to get ahead of his fellows in such a way as would enable him to accumulate labour cheques and so

retire and live upon the interest to be derived from them. (We use the words "labour cheques" reservedly, but our remarks will apply whatever the form of reward ultimately decided upon may be.)

Of course, under no circumstances could any man, however clever he became in his trade, set up for himself. The utmost advancement he could receive would be to become one of the State controllers of labour.

Now, is a man less of a "wage slave" if he be working for 44,000,000 persons and himself, than he is if he be working for an individual employer? Will his toil be less onerous because he is working —*so far as a forty-fourth million share of the product of his labour goes*—for himself?

There is one point further on which we are entitled to lay stress. That is the freedom of the individual. Nowadays, whenever they can, men choose their own trade for themselves. Of course at the present time labour conditions restrict the area of selection, but still there is, in many cases, great scope for the individual as regards the choice of employment.

Under Socialism the State would organise industry and sanction the selection of employment. As it is the aim of Socialism to secure for every one an equality of opportunity, every one would consider himself to be entitled to be placed in the more attractive forms of labour; and it is open to the ambitious under existing conditions to enter into competition for those positions.

Socialism, however, would sternly regulate employment, and would decree each man's calling for him. A man might desire to be an electrical engineer.

"No vacancies," says the State. "Ah, but I am sure I can prove myself to be a much better man than some whom you have chosen," replies the applicant. "No outside competition is allowed," says the State. "We want masons, and a mason you must be." "But have I no personal freedom?" replies the man. The answer is that he belongs to the State; and, if the official is in the mood to graciously explain matters further, the man will probably be told that it is difficult enough to organise labour at all, and that the attempt would become impossible if any one were so selfish as to consider such a trivial matter as his own inclinations.

We may well ask then where the much advertised "equality of opportunity" comes in? The question presents itself: Is not a man's ability more likely to be recognised by an employer working for profit under the present system than it would be by a State official, whose one object would be to sustain his position and that of the official class, which would be threatened by every worker who displayed ability in excess of that possessed by the general level?

Competition can never be wholly stifled. There would always be some keen men possessed of ambition. And they would be the very men whom the officials would, in practice, seek to keep under. As likely as not, these unfortunate fellows would fight for a time, but they would probably find that the system was too strong for them, and so, crushed and disciplined, they would fall back into the rut of mediocrity—these men who, if it had not been for the Socialist system, might have been of high utility to progress and the country.

Under existing conditions, if a skilled workman is not satisfied with his foreman or employer, he has at least the opportunity of seeking another with whom he can work more agreeably. Under Socialism there would be but one employer, and if any man got into disfavour, his record would always come up against him. Suppose, for instance, that the carpenters were dissatisfied with their conditions of work. Probably a deputation from the carpenters would move in the matter. The disturbance might be serious, and would certainly give the officials increased work. Now, would not the ringleaders be marked down? Would not the officials owe a grudge in the future against them?

Mr. Sidney Webb may probably have had some such an occurrence in mind when he wrote in Fabian Tract, No. 51: "If a man wants freedom to work or not to work just as he likes, he had better emigrate to Robinson Crusoe's island, or else become a millionaire. To suppose that the industrial affairs of a complicated industrial State can be run without *strict subordination and discipline*, without obedience to orders, and without definite allowances for maintenance, is to dream, not of Socialism, but of Anarchism." [1]

So the "wage slaves" may know their fate. Under Socialism they will still work for a wage, most probably to be paid in kind. The State will sanction the selection of their employment, and, whether they like it or not, they will have to work for one master —the State. In addition, they are promised "strict subordination and discipline, and obedience to orders."

[1] P. 18.

Are they not better off as "wage slaves" than they are ever likely to be as State slaves?

Socialists affirm that the people under the Socialist *régime* cannot possibly be slaves, because they will themselves nominate their overseers, or, at all events, the superiors of the various heads of departments which are to control their work.

It would be as reasonable to contend that because the people in this country at present elect the majority from which is formed the Ministry, which (*inter alia*) controls the Post-Office — therefore no Post-Office employee can possibly possess any valid grievance, because the majority have in reality selected the Postmaster-General, who is the head of the Department.

Socialism and Monopoly

Individual Ability to be Appropriated by the State

What is it that the Socialist really means when he talks of "monopoly"?

Mr. Jowett, M.P., in a recent article in *The Morning Post*,[1] in accounting for the progress of Socialism in this country, specially emphasised the influence of Mr. Robert Blatchford's *Merrie England*, of which, he says, over 1,000,000 copies have been sold. In this same book, Mr. Blatchford propounds the doctrine of Socialism and monopoly, as follows: "Just as no man can have a right to the land, because no man makes the land, so no man has a right to his self, because he did not make that self."[2]

In *The Fabian Essays*, Mr. Sidney Olivier writes:

[1] July 24, 1907.

[2] *Merrie England*, p. 75.

"The apology for individualist appropriation is exploded by the logic of the facts of communist production ; *no man can pretend to claim the fruits of his own labour ;* for his whole ability and opportunity for working are plainly a vast inheritance and contribution of which he is but a transient and accidental beneficiary and steward ; and his power of turning them to his own account depends entirely upon the desires and needs of other people for his services." [1]

Equally instructive is the following passage by Mr. J. L. Joynes in *The Socialist Catechism*, reprinted from the Social Democratic organ *Justice*.

"*Q.* What is the Socialist view of the duties of those who are specially gifted by nature ?

"*Ans.* That they owe a larger return to the community than those who are less naturally gifted, *because their gifts and their development are the resultants of social environment.*" [2]

In the first place, "it is *not* true," as Dr. Schäffle rightly observes, "that each separate person in his peculiar individuality is a *mere* product of the whole society ; he is also the product of his own personal activities as well as of the activities of other individuals, of special efforts and labours in the whole course of generations." [3]

The not uncommon example of two brothers receiving the same upbringing and educational advantages, and who yet exhibit in after-life totally different degrees of ability, demonstrates how ridiculous is the Socialist assertion that ability results merely from "social environment."

[1] P. 127. [2] P. 13.

[3] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 59.

What, in this connection, could be more common than for a younger brother, if at the same school with an elder brother, to surpass the latter at his work. Most persons, surely, can recall instances of this.

Yet if the "social environment" theory be correct, the elder brother, with equal advantages *shared in for a longer period* than the younger, *must* necessarily retain the lead which his age in this case should confer upon him.

Far more important, however, are the consequences which Socialists seek by this means to justify.

This theory that personal ability and character confer no merit on the individual is propounded by Socialists as the justification *for not only depriving the individual of what he has by his talent personally produced; but, also, for conferring on others possessed of no such qualities an "unearned increment" derived from the ability of the former.*

Hence Socialism, in practice, would lead to a far greater extension of "unearned increment" than exists, or ever can exist, under the present system.

Socialism would, in fact, "do in its own way deliberately and universally, just that very thing which it reproaches Capital for doing, far more and more universally than Capital really does." [1]

A Monster Monopoly

With the cry of "Down with Monopoly!" on their lips, the Socialists are seeking to establish at the same time a monopoly which will be all-embracing.

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, by Dr. Schäffle, p. 60.

"Now, a State monopoly is Socialism, . . ." writes Mr. Blatchford in *Merrie England.*[1]

Monopoly, so we learn from Mr. H. M. Hyndman, "must be collectivised, but placed under democratic control, not that of the capitalist State."[2]

Nothing could well be hazier than the Socialist definition of the term "monopoly." The mere fact that some one else happens to be possessed of something which the Socialists are without, *ipso facto* converts the possession into a monopoly.

It is true, of course, that there may be a monopoly in some particular piece of land, within certain limits, but there is no monopoly in land as a form of investment. Thousands of acres of land are always in the open market.

Similarly with regard to other forms of investment. It seems to be absurd that the owner of shares in some one of the hundreds of colliery companies in this country should be dubbed a monopolist. He is nothing less to the Socialist way of thinking, for the reason that he will decline to hand over a valuable interest—for nothing. Thus the Socialists who find that they can acquire nothing of value without paying for it denounce the men who have paid as monopolists, and are agitating for the destruction of monopolies. The man who takes for himself what is not his goes to prison. The Socialists are more astute. They say we will take it "for the people."

When Socialists denounce monopolies their real

[1] P. 96.

[2] *Social Democracy.* Reprint of a Lecture delivered at Queen's Hall, London, April 14, 1904, p. 27.

objective is the competitive system. They realise that it is only by success under competition that the majority of these so-called "monopolists" have acquired their possessions. Similarly, in a large proportion of cases, it is because the Socialists have failed under competition that they are what they are.

Mr. Hyndman, for example, asserts: ". . . We hold that competition in itself is harmful."[1]

"We say that competition is bad, that it means the strongest and not the best winning . . ." declares Mr. H. Quelch of the Social Democratic Federation.[2]

How wholly illogical is this blatant denunciation of both monopoly and competition by Socialists was demonstrated long since by Mr. J. S. Mill in his *Principles of Political Economy.*

". . . One of their greatest errors," wrote Mill in referring to the Socialists, "as I conceive, is to charge upon competition all the economical evils which at present exist. *They forget that wherever competition is not, monopoly is, and that monopoly in all its forms is the taxation of the industrious for the support of indolence, if not of plunder.*"[3]

The effects which flow from monopolies, properly so termed, and which have been described by Mill, are inherent in all strict forms of monopoly. They will be no less present, and be just as baneful, in a huge State monopoly as they are in those in private hands. Monopoly is the acutest form of industrial tyranny. Under our present system the monopolist alone fixes the price of his goods. The

[1] *The Single Tax v. Social Democracy* (Twentieth Century Press), p. 9.
[2] *Socialism and the Single Tax*, p. 15.
[3] *Principles of Political Economy*, Book IV., chapter vii. section 7.

public can obtain the commodity from no one else. If the public will not pay the price, the public must go unserved.

There is, however, one respect in which the monopolist of the present day ceases to be irresponsible. He cannot fix the price of the labour he employs. As an employer, he must go into the labour market like every one else.

Under the huge State monopoly of Socialism, on the other hand, the State would not only determine the retail price of commodities, but would also fix its own labour rates. There would be no competition to test the justice of prices, and every one would be compelled to work for the State or to starve. Every one, moreover, would be made to do the work which the State ordered them to do, wholly apart from individual ability or inclination.

"For every Man the full Product of his Labour"

The Marxian theory of value, at all events in the mouth of the ordinary Socialist speaker, postulates that all wealth is produced by *manual* labour.

The Socialists were quick in realising the enormous vote-catching value of this fallacy. "You make it all—and it is all yours," they exclaim.

The next step is the announcement that under Socialism capital in private hands will be abolished, rent and interest will also be done away with, and the worker, who alone—so they assert—produces anything, will receive the whole of the product of his labour.

"It is true that at present the frugal workman only gets about one-third of his earnings. Under Socialism, he (the worker) would get *all* his earnings," writes Mr. Blatchford in *Merrie England*.[1]

The right to the full produce of labour, which is what the Socialists promise their adherents, means, as Mr. Rae emphasises, "as explained by them," *nothing less than "the right to the entire product of labour and capital together."*[2]

Assuming, then, for present purposes for the sake of argument, that the Marxian theory is sound, and that all capital has been produced by *manual* labour alone, it is certain that some proportion of capital is held in one form or another by the manual labourers who have made it. That capital represents labour which has been endured. The Socialist proposal is that it should be taken away from the men who earned it, and should be utilised as the Socialist State should deem fit.

It will be obvious, however, that the claims of manual labour to the whole of the product of labour in all forms are wholly untenable.

Even if, however, we admit for the moment these pretensions of *manual* labour, it will be evident that the Socialist promise that "labour" shall receive its *full* product is one which can *never* be fulfilled either under Socialism or under any other system of production.

Quite apart from the question of the possibility or the impossibility of its fulfilment, this bait of the whole produce of labour is used very unscrupulously by some Socialists. To take their stand at the

[1] P. 189.

[2] *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 420.

factory gate, as Socialists to-day frequently do, and to assure the workers that they alone are responsible for the produce of the factory, and that under Socialism they will receive the whole of the produce of that factory, is both untrue and unfair.

In the passage following, Mr. Sidney Webb clearly shows that Socialism does not intend to attempt even to fulfil such a promise.

"The whole of our creed is that industry should be carried on, not for the profit of those engaged in it, whether masters or men, but for the benefit of the community. We recognise no special right in the miners, as such, to enjoy the mineral wealth on which they work. The Leicester boot operatives can put in no special claim to the profits of the Leicester boot factory, nor the shopmen in a co-operative store to the surplus of its year's trading. It is not for the miners, bootmakers, or shop assistants, as such, that we Socialists claim the control and the profits of industry, but for the citizens."[1]

The moment that the workers clearly realise that the particular centre of their own labours is *not* to become a profit-producing concern for themselves; but that, on the other hand, all that they are to receive under Socialism is a forty-fourth million part (or whatever may be the precise present population of the United Kingdom) in the sum total of the whole country's production—from that moment Socialism will fail in a direct appeal.

We have proved elsewhere that under Socialism the gross total product must diminish, nor will this diminished product go direct to the workers.

[1] Fabian Tract, No. 51, p. 16.

The chief deductions against which the Socialists inveigh are those for rent and interest. If we accept the Socialist figures, they amount conjointly to a total of £650,000,000 per annum. Far the greater part of this sum, however, finds its way back to industry, and discharges the essential function of providing for extension, renewals, &c.

Surely it is unnecessary to point out that factories and plant do not endure for ever, and if the renewal fund is not furnished by private capital, as is the case at present, it must be supplied by the State and be a first deduction, and a heavy one too, from the gross total product. Surely, also, it is superfluous to emphasise that if provision is to be made for an ever-increasing population, capital must be forthcoming to provide fresh factories, &c.

The existence of official overseers and superintendents is a necessary part of the Socialist State. These latter will certainly have to be paid at the same rate as, if not at a higher rate than, the labourers. The ordinary workers, therefore, *according to Socialist teaching*, will still be mulcted by having to work for the support of what is now represented by most Socialists to be *a non-producing class*.

It is evident, therefore, that Socialism, if ever the Socialist State becomes a *fait accompli*, will have forthwith to repudiate by its action, if not in words, the doctrine that *manual* labour is the source of all value.

How wholly false are the current statements of the ordinary Socialist speaker on this point is demonstrated by the following passage from the well-known essay descriptive of "Industry under Socialism," by Mrs. Annie Besant:—

"*Out of the value of the communal produce must come rent of land payable to the local authority, rent of plant needed for working the industries, wages advanced and fixed in the usual way, taxes, reserve fund, accumulation fund, and the other charges necessary for the carrying on of the communal business.* All these deducted, the remaining value should be divided among the communal workers as a 'bonus.'" [1]

"As a bonus!" Yes! but what reasonable ground is there for assuming that any residue under the Socialist *régime* will, *after* these numerous deductions have been made, exist capable of providing a bonus.

Is it not quite as, if not more, reasonable to assume that the results which accompanied Louis Blanc's famous experiment in 1848 (see as to this, p. 163) will attach to industry under the Socialist *régime?* When "the balance was to be divided as profit, *alas! it was a balance of loss, not of gain. . . .*" [2]

When reluctantly forced to admit these deductions from the gross product of industry, Socialist speakers usually produce a set-off. They turn to industry, and state that to-day, owing to trade rivalry and competition generally, there is much wastage. Many firms in the same trade are, they point out, competing with each other. Whereas, so they claim, if every trade were represented by one firm only there would be a great saving. They then beg the whole question, and assume that the consumer would benefit thereby.

Surely we have yet to learn that monopoly in any

[1] *Fabian Essays*, p. 163.

[2] See *The Economist* for May 20, 1848, quoted by Mr. M. D. O'Brien in *Socialism Tested by Facts*, p. 24.

form is to the interest of the consumer. From the moment that competition is abolished, all safeguards, so far as the consumer is concerned, are at an end. The only concern of the men employed in any one trade under Socialism would be to have as easy a time as possible. And this attitude of the workers would inevitably be reflected in a general all-round increase in the cost of production.

Again, the Socialists turn to the army of commercial travellers who are to-day engaged by the competing firms, and announce that in that matter there will be a clean saving. On the contrary, we believe that an even increased number would be necessary under Socialism. It is true that they would not be required for the purpose of pushing the State's wares, but they certainly would be needed in large numbers for the purpose of ascertaining, as accurately as such a thing is possible, what the next year's Budget of social production must be.

At present, if some individual manufacturer is unable to meet the demand for his goods, trade rivals are ever ready to supply the deficiency. Under Socialism there will be *only one* producing firm. *Unless*, therefore, the public demand is most accurately gauged—in some lines more than a year in advance—there will be a deficiency in supply, with all that that entails upon the community *quâ* consumer.

Inversely, if the State over-produce, what is it to do with its surplus stock? Dumping would, we imagine, be considered as an unfriendly act towards another Socialist State. Possibly the public would be compelled to purchase. On the whole, the further

this phase of Socialism is critically examined, the more difficult and impracticable it appears to be.

It must *not* be supposed that the passage here previously quoted from Mrs. Besant's essay on "Industry under Socialism" by any means comprises *all* the deductions that will, under Socialism, have to be made from the gross total product.

Here are a few more instances of deductions which the workers must face.

Under Socialism we are informed by Mrs. Philip Snowden that—

"Married women with children will not work in the factory, at least until the children are out of their hands." [1]

Also, "No children will be permitted to work for wages, or for anything but their own instruction." [2]

Mr. John Spargo, another Socialist writer, describes how, under Socialism, "The immature child, the aged, the sick and infirm members of society would alone be exempted from labour." [3]

The foregoing list would, in practice, prove sufficiently formidable in point of numbers.

All these would have to be maintained. All, moreover, for their support would be dependent upon the State; and *the only way in which the State would be able to provide for their maintenance would be by a deduction from the gross total product of the community.*

In short, the wages of the worker, instead of, as under the present industrial system, representing *a first charge* on the business, will be paid only out

[1] *The Woman Socialist*, p. 81. [2] P. 81.
[3] *Socialism*, p. 228. Published 1906.

of the residue (if any). The State would have nothing with which to pay its expenses, and the cost of its numberless agents and officials, save the gross total product of industry. Rodbertus, who has powerfully influenced many Socialist writers, though not himself a Socialist, conceded that this promise, that the whole national income would be divided among the workers, was *incapable of fulfilment.*[1]

The whole system of taxation would, it is true, be altered under Socialism. But Socialists have yet to prove that the amount levied from the production of each (by previous deduction) would be less, and not more, under Socialism than under the existing system.

The strong probability is, if we take into account, for example, the inordinate number of officials which the Socialist State would require to employ, that the State exactions would have to be very greatly increased. Thus, "*The leading promise of Social Democracy is practically and theoretically untenable; it is a delusive bait for the extreme individualistic fanatic craving for equality among the masses.*"[2]

Needless to say, Socialism dare not to-day admit the fact that its leading promise is wholly incapable of performance. Were it to do so, Socialism would forthwith be shorn of what ranks as one of its *chief* attractions in the eyes of the industrial working-classes.

In view, then, of the foregoing, it would consequently be indiscreet to express too much thankfulness

[1] See *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, by Dr. Schäffle, p. 106.
[2] *The Quintessence of Socialism*, by Dr. Schäffle, p. 122.

for the concession which a leading Socialist includes in a recent work. Under Socialism, "If Jones prefers *objets d'art*, and Smith prefers *fast horses or a steam yacht*, each will be free to follow his inclinations so far as his resources will permit." [1]

Will Socialism, in effect, abolish Capitalism?

To this important question M. Émile Faguet replies, after giving to it the most careful consideration, in the negative. In his opinion the State officials will, under Socialism, be enabled to dispense a superiority of enjoyment and of power.

As all things are relative, this will, in effect, be equivalent to the creation of a new caste. In this way, if in no other, a capitalist *régime* will in practice be restored—a form of capitalism, moreover, which, *in the minds of all those denied such favours*, will give rise to quite as much discontent and jealousy as the present-day capitalism.[2]

Thus, in the words of President Butler, "*Socialism would wreck the world's efficiency for the purpose of redistributing the world's discontent.*" [3]

If the labourer is to-day the slave of capital, he would be no less the slave to it were all capital amalgamated and he the reputed owner of $\frac{1}{44,000,000}$th *indivisible* part (or whatever be the precise fraction of the present population of the United Kingdom which each to-day represents).

[1] *Socialism*, by Mr. John Spargo, p. 236. Published 1906.
[2] See *Le Socialisme en* 1907, p. 222.
[3] *True and False Democracy*, p. ix. (Preface).

"The slave," writes Biétry, "is one who possesses nothing, neither his implements nor the produce of his labour. Socialism, which dispossesses every man, is consequently a doctrine of slavery." After quoting the foregoing statement, M. Faguet proceeds to state that the Collectivists are men who say to the workmen, "*Very few among you are owners; what we desire is that none of you should be owners.*" [1]

"If we expropriate capitalism, we must at the same time take over its social functions," writes Karl Kautsky, the celebrated International Socialist, in his work entitled *On the Morrow of the Social Revolution;* "among these the important one of capitalist accumulation. The capitalists do not consume all their income; a portion of it they put away for the extension of production." [2]

It is evident, therefore, from this admission on the part of one of the most leading Socialists of the present day, that Socialism will *not* be able to fulfil its promise of dividing up amongst the workers in the Collectivist State the whole of the product of Industry.

"Interest is just," writes Mr. Rae, "because capital is socially useful, and because the owner of capital, in applying it to productive purposes, renders a service to society which is valuable in the measure of its social utility. Of course, the State might perform this service itself. It might compulsorily abstract from the produce of each year a sufficient portion to constitute the raw materials and instruments of future production. . . ." Instead, "It leaves the

[1] See *Le Socialisme en* 1907, pp. 301 and 302.
[2] Translated by J. B. Askew, p. 17.

service to be rendered spontaneously by private persons out of their private means."

This of necessity entails the continuance of the payment of interest. "Nobody," as continues Mr. Rae, "will set aside a portion of his property to provide for future production if he is to reap no advantage from doing so, and if the produce is to be distributed in exactly the same way whether he sets it apart or not."[1]

"The real question," proceeds Mr. Rae, "for Socialists to answer is not whether it is just to pay private capitalists for the service society accepts at their hands, but whether society can perform this service *better, or more economically*, without them—whether, in short, the abolition of interest would conduce to any real saving in the end. This practical question, crucial though it be, is one, however, to which they seldom address themselves—they prefer expatiating in cloudier regions. . . . Capitalistic management is proverbially unrivalled for two qualities in which bureaucratic management is as proverbially deficient—economy and enterprise."[2]

"Consequences which are distant but one remove from the primary or direct one," are, as was observed by Professor Lecky, realised by only very few. Yet if experience has proved beyond doubt one thing more effectually than another, it is that attacks on capital inevitably lead to its migration.

To whose disadvantage do such attacks in practice mostly redound? The answer to this question is,

[1] *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, pp. 329 and 330.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 330.

undoubtedly, to those whose livelihood depends on the wages earned by them.

The late John Ruskin, from whose writings Socialists so frequently quote, in addressing the working classes has forcibly pictured what for them must be the results of such a policy.

"If you could pass laws to-morrow wholly favourable to yourselves, as you might think," wrote Ruskin, "because unfavourable to your masters and to the upper classes of Society, *the only result would be that the riches of the country would at once leave it, and you would perish in riot and famine.*"[1]

So important are the consequences which must inevitably accrue from such proposals as those, for example, advocated by Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., in *The Socialist's Budget*, that if their baneful effects are to be averted, it is high time that these consequences should be more generally realised in this country.

"If a House of Commons were elected which accepted the Socialist programme," wrote the late Professor Lecky in referring to the United Kingdom, "long before that Parliament had time to assemble countless millions of capital would have passed out of the land. . . . In no age of the world could such a calamity be more easily produced, for *never before could capital be so quickly and easily displaced, and in no other country do industry and employment more largely depend upon national credit.*"[2]

Such a course of taxation as that which Socialists like Mr. Snowden to-day advocate would injure the

[1] *Time and Tide*, p. 16.
[2] *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 394.

classes in whose behalf it is ostensibly propounded far more than the classes against whom it is directed.

As Viscount St. Aldwyn, speaking with the experience and authority of an ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, observed on January 27, 1908: "In these days of international finance nothing would be easier than for persons unfairly taxed to conceal the bulk of their income. A great deal of income now bearing the tax would escape altogether, because the owners would be provoked by a deep sense of injustice. They would escape Socialistic attacks just as easily as the rich merchants of the Middle Ages eluded the exactions of malignant and rapacious Barons." [1]

Will Socialism abolish Exploitation?

One of the many promises which Socialism makes, and is totally incapable of fulfilling, is to bring about the abolition of exploitation.

Under Socialism "labourer could very really exploit labourer, the administrators could exploit those under them, *the lazy could exploit the industrious*, the impudent their more modest fellow-workers, and the demagogue those who opposed him." [2]

When we recall the conditions of the Socialist scheme of distribution we realise how sound this warning is.

"From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs." There is, indeed, magnificent scope for "exploitation" there. Who is to be

[1] *The Morning Post*, January 28, 1908.
[2] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, by Dr. Schäffle, translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 88.

the judge alike of the ability and of the needs? Who is to say what is to be the standard of sloth which will pass muster as the sum of ability, and entitle the "worker" to the same amount of "needs" as those which the hard-working man enjoys. To-day we are told "the capitalist" exploits the workers. Under Socialism a few millions of lazy citizens would exploit the few honest workers who might be left.

Nor would it be for long that the latter would continue under a Socialist *régime* to exert themselves. So soon as these fully realised that their work was going *mainly towards the support of others less industrious than themselves*, and that the fruits of their energy were not to be gathered by themselves, all incentive to exertion would vanish. Forthwith they would recognise the folly of attempting, under such a method of distribution, to accomplish more than the State *minimum* of work.

The Personal Incentive

When human needs are standardised and the hope of gain is by the Socialist principle of distribution, "To each according to his needs," effectually eliminated, will the workers in any branch of industry continue to give of their best?

This is an all-important problem, for if there be any widespread diminution in individual effort, the general production of the whole country must suffer. This is another of the questions which Socialists habitually beg. It is perfectly true, of course, that in the lower grades of labour a considerable section of the community might for a time rest content, if,

in exchange for just the bare amount of toil that might pass muster, they had guaranteed to them the necessities of life.

It is not at this point, however, that the problem becomes so grave. Unless the higher ranks were equally satisfied (and we include in them the expert foremen and managers, the inventors of new processes, and the great organisers of industry), if these men are not satisfied, then the position in regard to the national income is serious indeed.

In *Merrie England*[1] Mr. Robert Blatchford argues, that because "men strive at cricket," and display "intense effort" and "fierce zeal" at football, it is immaterial to men whether their work brings them "gain" or not.

This specious argument is frequently put forward by Socialists. The obvious differences are that cricket is a pastime; work is *not*. The former is voluntary; the latter, under Socialism, is to be compulsory. Moreover, if gain is *not* the incentive to work, why is it that the vast majority of men at present make it their chief object in working?

The soldier will, states Mrs. Besant in the *Fabian Essays*, "dare anything for glory, and value a bit of bronze, which is the reward of valour, far more than a hundred times its weight in gold."[2]

Here, again, we have a repetition of a similar fallacy.

The very fact that the Socialists are compelled to turn to the Army for an example of work for the State made attractive in the alleged absence of a

[1] Pages 119–120.
[2] "Industry under Socialism," *Fabian Essays*, p. 168.

cumulating personal gain proves the inherent weakness of their case. The Army is intensely individualistic, and good service carries with it as the direct reward promotion and increased pay. Even in the case of the Army we have yet to learn that increased pay supplies no incentive. If such be the case, why is it of late years that in this country the State has deemed it necessary to materially increase both the private soldier's pay, as also to grant to him substantial benefits in other ways?

The State is most certainly not accustomed to adopt such a course *unless* compelled by circumstances. The Socialist argument, even in this respect, is on inspection ascertained to be unsound.

The fact, also, that the Government turns employer does not make the undertaking Socialistic. The very pivot of service in the Army is competition, with chances of promotion and graduated rewards according to merit. Every man who joins knows that by smartness and good work he will win promotion, and that that promotion will not only carry honour with it, but increasing comforts as well. The knowledge that the men are serving their king and country beyond doubt sweetens and dignifies the profession of arms, but surely a similar feeling would be lacking in the service of a Socialist State.

Socialism, as we have shown in the chapter on the monarchy (see p. 131), will assuredly involve the abolition of the monarchy. The personal incentive to the soldier, which loyalty to-day in this country provides, will consequently be lacking.

The Socialist argument to the effect that because men are willing to risk their lives on the field of

"Inkerman" (as writes Mr. Blatchford), &c., therefore the bestowal of a red ribbon by the chief Socialist bureaucrat will be deemed of itself sufficient recompense by the inventor, the engineer, the architect, and the other principal contributors to social progress is no less fallacious than the foregoing Socialist examples of special pleading.

The present State and municipal employees (*e.g.* Post-Office employees, municipal tramwaymen, &c., &c.) provide no support for the Socialist theory that men are indifferent to the rate of wages.

When challenged on the point as to whether a man of outstanding ability is not really deserving of a higher wage than the less ably equipped, the Socialists have two forms of reply. The one is that if a man, however able he may be, gets all that he needs, he cannot eat two dinners or live in two houses. This is, of course, no sort of an answer. With such a man it is not a question of eating two dinners ; his incentive to work proceeds largely from the spirit of emulation and the desire to surpass the ordinary rank and file, which is so deeply engrained in human nature.

Surely the Socialists, who claim that environment has so profound an effect upon temperament and character, are the last people who should urge that a high level of original work can be expected from a relatively low standard of life.

The other Socialist form of reply to the claims of ability to enhanced conditions is to assert that ability is widespread. To this end the most fulsome flattery is lavished on the crowd. Each member of the audience is led to believe that if the universities had

not been closed to the workers—and, by the way, they are not—each and all of them would have been a Plato or a Socrates, a Darwin or a Huxley.

So strongly marked in human nature is self-conceit that each man, as a rule, readily believes that this is really true of himself, although he ridicules the truth of the assurance in the case of any other man in the crowd. Indeed, since Mr. John Burns has won Cabinet rank, there is no Socialist orator in the parks who does not secretly believe that he is every bit as good a man.

Of course, the factor for which no credit is allowed is force of character. That counts for more than ability in the attainment of individual success, and most of our leading men of to-day are where they are because they meant to be there. They made their opportunity, and towered above their environment and the difficulties of their condition.

In gauging the effect of personal incentive too much importance is paid by the Socialists to men in literature and the fine arts. Those are not the tests. The British are a commercial people, and having regard to our vast numbers must remain so for all time. The question, then, is *not* whether we shall be able to obtain good literature and works of art if the personal incentive of hard cash be destroyed, but rather the point is whether our great concerns and industrial undertakings will be captainless. For centuries gain has been the call to individual advance in commerce and in industry, and no sort of a case has been made out to prove that without the incentive of gain those supreme efforts of the great directors of industry would be continued.

Socialism takes upon itself also to totally abolish

one of the strongest characteristics of civilised nations, namely, the spirit of speculation.

Instead, therefore, of being a system founded on the instincts of human nature, Socialism, as observes Professor Graham, contemptuously ignores even the strongest of human passions.[1]

The highly-coloured picture of "the capitalist," to which the Socialist speaker invariably treats his audience, is self-contradictory in the extreme.

One moment "the capitalist" is portrayed as a vampire living on the vitals of the poor, whose *sole* object in life is the quest of wealth. The next he is described as so hopelessly indifferent to his own pecuniary interests as to tolerate in his business in all departments the most unnecessary multiplication and overlapping of subordinates and assistants.

The present system, in reality, offers the highest encouragement to the employer to conduct his business on economic lines. Socialism, with its vast bureaucracy, would lack all such direct personal incentives to economic working. The interest of the head officials would be *not* to extend, but rather to reduce, the orbit of their own personal work and responsibility, so far as compatible with the maintenance of their position.

Successful production depends very largely upon the willingness of capital to undertake new risks and to try new methods. A universal State monopoly would be by nature exceptionally opposed to both change and risk. Socialism would therefore prevent others from doing what it itself would decline to undertake. As a consequence the quantum of

[1] See *Socialism, New and Old*, pp. 221–225.

production would decrease, instead of, as at present, continuously increasing.

President Butler of Columbia University, in the passage following, draws attention to the general consequences which would accrue were the Socialist course of action to be carried into effect: "The world wants more wealth, not less. To aim to destroy wealth, to make its accumulation impossible or personally disadvantageous, is *to disturb and distress the world, and ultimately every one in it.*" [1]

If the action of Socialism would prove to be injurious in the case of the civilised world generally, in the case of the United Kingdom its results would be specially hurtful on account of our wholly artificial conditions.

". . . In an overcrowded country like England, whose prosperity rests much less on great natural resources than on the continuance of a precarious and highly artificial commercial and manufacturing supremacy, any revolution," states the late Professor Lecky, "*that may lead to a migration of capital or the destruction of credit is more than commonly dangerous.*" [2]

Socialism's Wages

Seeing that payment is, in all probability, to be according to individual needs, we may be sure that every possible attempt will be made to standardise those needs. With the allowances for difference in physical requirements, it is unlikely that there will be very wide variations between man and man. The

[1] *True and False Democracy*, p. 27.
[2] *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. i. p. 222.

greater difficulty will arise in the determining of the respective hours of labour in the thousand and one employments upon terms of some sort of equality.

Not only is it impossible to fix on a just measure of comparison between, *e.g.* hard manual work and routine work, or between skilled and unskilled work, or between mental and manual labour; but it is also impossible to estimate by the amount of production the value of labour in, for instance, two different woollen or cotton factories, *unless* in each instance the machinery in the two different factories is of a precisely equal degree of productivity.

Socialists, in speculating about labour time, invariably consider only *factory* labour.

How many days of how many hours per day does it take, as Mr. Stanley Robertson asks, to produce a ton of wheat, or potatoes, or hay, or beans?

Again, "How many hours per day of 'social labour' will prepare a bullock or a sheep for the market, or a milch cow to yield her daily supply of milk?" Further, "How many hours a day ought a sailor to work, for example, and how is the value of an hour of his work to be ascertained in comparison with the value of an hour's work of a street lamplighter, or a letter-carrier?"[1]

Let us take yet another instance—the case of the miner. Not only is the coal in some pits more difficult to get than it is in others, but the distance which the worker is called upon to travel from bank to bank, and from pit-head to seam, varies not only

[1] "The Impracticability of Socialism." Published in *A Plea for Liberty*, pp. 40, 41.

in different pits, but even in the different locations in the same pit.

Thus, if a fixed output of coal per man were decided upon—supposing that such a step were practicable—great injustice would result. If, on the other hand, remuneration were irrespective of output, sloth is encouraged and a huge economic leakage at once presents itself. If the difficulties in any one trade are as grave as these, how will it be possible to arrive at an equitable, or even approximate, estimate or equation of labour-value for the industries of the whole country? Remember that failure in this does not only result in gross inequality and injustice, but the very existence of such factors will tend to diminish the total national production.

We think that too much stress cannot be laid on the fact that owing to the necessities of the case, a man's needs must be declared as being earned irrespective of the value of his labour.

This is a complete subversion of the basis of the commercial world. And quite apart from the disastrous consequences affecting production which would surely flow from it, the scheme itself is reared upon a fallacy. For labour has no value in and for itself. There is much truth in the old saying that a thing is worth what it fetches. A moment's thought will suggest countless instances of labour which, costly though it may have been, is waste and worthless. Here again is yet another form in which a deduction must be made from that product of labour the whole of which (so the Socialists assert) is to go to the workers.

Remuneration will, moreover, in all probability be paid in kind. The reasons which indicate that this, under Socialism, will be the case have been stated elsewhere (see p. 148). Payment would then be made by labour cheques, which on presentation at the State store would, we will assume, be honoured. One thing is certain; that is, that the choice of goods would be restricted to what the State thought fit to produce. But what is this but an enforcement of the Truck system? *In short, "... The Truck system which," according to Mr. Hyndman, "filches wages ..."*[1] *is the system which Socialism intends to universally enforce.*

Surely the abolition of the Truck system in England is not so remote that men have entirely forgotten the tyranny which it frequently involved.

Lord Beaconsfield's *Sybil* contains a striking picture of the evils to be encountered under that system. "The question is," says one of the characters in *Sybil*, "what *is* wages? ... I don't think 'tis candles; but of this I be sure, 'tayn't waistcoats. ... You know as how Juggins applied for his balance, and Diggs has made him take two waistcoats. Now the question 'rises, what is a collier to do with waistcoats? Pawn 'em, I s'pose, to Diggs' son-in-law, next door to his father's shop, and sell the ticket for sixpence."

Socialists to-day loudly condemn the system, yet no sooner is the Socialist State to become a reality than it is proposed to universally enforce State-truck. No argument whatsoever is brought forward with a view, if possible, to show that a system, which in

[1] *England for All*, p. 68.

the past proved a fertile source of fraud, will, if revived, be unaccompanied by similar results.

Universal Socialism, or Banishment for Aliens

In this matter the Socialist is on the horns of a dilemma. The world is his brother, and he is all for throwing open the gates of the country to aliens. Indeed, if one may judge by his present sentiments, he vastly prefers the alien to his fellow-countrymen. To a large extent, of course, the Socialist movement is an alien movement. One can never listen to the speeches in the parks or at the street corners without being impressed with the activity of the foreigner in his desire to improve the conditions of a country which is not his own. Even more striking evidence of the same thing is furnished by the list of members of the Fabian Society. On reading those strange names, we cannot help wondering what it is that Great Britain has ever done to earn this gracious solicitude from the hands of the foreigner. And yet unless Socialism be simultaneously adopted by the countries of the world, these foreign apostles of Socialism will be driven away.

Mr. Thomas Kirkup emphasises an important matter of almost daily recurrence when he states: "Irishmen, Germans, Belgians, and Italians have often rendered unavailing the efforts of English and French workmen for a higher standard of living. Continuous emigration from Europe depresses American labour. The Chinese and other Eastern

races . . . menace the workmen of America and Australia." [1]

Either, therefore, Socialism must receive international acceptance—that is, be adopted at the same time by at all events the whole civilised world, *or* a Socialist State erected in this country must enforce the most drastic restrictions against immigration. This it will be compelled to do, *unless* all attempts to materially improve the social conditions of its inhabitants are to be nullified owing to a constant influx of population of a less high standard of living.

The Socialist author, Mr. Graham Wallas, writes: "What is necessary is that we face the fact, every day becoming plainer, that any determined attempt to raise the condition of the proletariat in any single European country *must be accompanied by a law of aliens* . . . stringent enough to exclude the unhappy *diluvies gentium*, the human rubbish which the military empires of the Continent are so ready to shoot upon any open space." [2]

When one takes into account the differences in the political situation and the constitution of parties in the various countries of the world, one realises that the simultaneous adoption of Socialism could be brought about by nothing less than a miracle.

Before such a thing is feasible not only have the different types of Socialists to agree amongst themselves, but they will find it necessary to bring the great peoples of the world into line with them

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, pp. 170, 171.
[2] *Fabian Essays*, p. 138.

on some practical scheme of Socialism which is acceptable to all.

Socialism and the Co-operative Movement

The Socialists, while they scout the notion that an extension of the co-operative movement would be an acceptable solution of the social question, are none the less ever ready to lay claim to the success which has attended co-operative management as an illustration of the ease by which the Socialist State could control industry. And in order to identify co-operative success with Socialism, repeated attempts are being made throughout this country by Socialists to capture the committees of management for their own members.

Perhaps the following quotation from the writings of the chief Socialist historian will be of service as a reply to the jibes of some of the Socialist speakers :—

"Of all the recent movements for the better ordering of society in England," writes Mr. Thomas Kirkup, "we believe the co-operative movement to be the most hopeful. . . ."[1]

Mr. Kirkup furnishes also some interesting figures respecting the growth in this country of co-operation :—

"The 1637" (co-operative) "societies numbered about 2,260,000 members in 1906. By that date the £28 with which the movement started in 1844 had expanded into a capital of £30,000,000, with an annual turnover of £94,000,000, and an annual profit of £10,500,000. It provides for the consumption of

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 353.

one-fifth of the population. The co-operative movement in Great Britain," adds the writer, "is already an industrial and economic power of no mean order. *If it has not solved the social question, it has at least done much to clear the way towards a solution.*" [1]

The success of the co-operative movement *is an argument against Socialism*, and *not* in favour of it. It is founded on self-help, and owes nothing to the monopolistic principle which is at the basis of the Socialist State. This fact cannot be too clearly recognised.

Mr. Kirkup himself very fairly states: "But we should not forget that *the most hopeful movement of recent times, the co-operative movement, owes little to the State*. The State has very great power, but it has no magical power." [2]

And, indeed, we perceive how true it is that the co-operative movement is no argument in favour of Socialism, when we realise that the men who exercise the real control are *not* the working-men committees but the expert managers at high wages. They are men who have been trained for their work, and they are paid according to the ability they display.

Further, not only are their salaries the reward for their present services, but they are aware that special ability and exertion will bring with them promotion and an increased rate of pay. What a different basis of service is this to the Socialist scheme of "From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs." Had the co-operative movement been

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 351.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 380.

conducted on that root Socialistic principle, then, and only then, would it have supplied any evidence of the practicability of the Socialist theory of management.

The Socialist Attitude towards Machinery

Machinery, so Mr. Belfort Bax asserts, "has proved *the greatest curse* mankind has ever suffered under. . . ."[1]

Mr. Belfort Bax again assures us that "the action of the 'Luddites' in destroying machinery, so far from being a mere irrational outburst, the result of popular misapprehension, as the orthodox economists assert, was *perfectly reasonable and justifiable.*"[2]

"But machinery not only," writes Karl Marx in his *Capital*, "acts as a competitor who gets the better of the workman, and is constantly on the point of making him superfluous. *It is also a power inimical to him.* . . ."[3]

Again, according to Marx, "In agriculture as in industry the machine employs and *enslaves the producer.*"[4] "In manufacture, he (the workman) is part of a living mechanism. In machinery he is the living appendage of a lifeless mechanism."[5]

The Socialist habitually denounces, as do Mr. Bax, Marx, and others, the use of machinery under the present system, though with Socialist consistency

[1] *The Religion of Socialism*, p. 75. See also the essay on the "Industrial Basis of Socialism," by Mr. W. Clarke, in the *Fabian Essays*.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 157–158.
[3] P. 436, English translation.
[4] *The Students' Marx*, by Dr. Edward Aveling, p. 106.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 89.

he predicts a vast extension of its use in the Socialist State.

In *Industry under Socialism* Mrs. Annie Besant foretells a greatly extended use of machinery by the Socialist State. "What we shall probably do will be to instruct all our youth in the principles of mechanics and the handling of machines . . . the skilled workman will be the *skilled mechanic, not* the skilled printer or bootmaker."[1]

By another Socialist writer, Mr. John Spargo, we are informed: "In the first place, much of this kind of work that is now performed by human labour could be more efficiently done by mechanical means."[2]

The same policy is propounded by innumerable Socialist writers.

The Socialist position in this matter is grotesque indeed. The existing system of society is inveighed against for the reason, amongst others, that it does not provide work for all who need it. Strangely enough, the Socialist State offers as one of its main attractions a diminution in "the tragedy of toil." And machinery, which we are assured by Socialists is a baneful factor at present, is to be the blessed means of securing greater leisure under Socialism.

The Socialist estimate of the effect of machinery upon the labour market is yet another of their false conclusions. Machinery does *not* diminish employment, but, on the contrary, it actually increases it. It is true, we grant, that in the earlier stages when a

[1] *Fabian Essays*, p. 161.

[2] *Socialism*, p. 231. And see Mr. R. B. Suthers' article in the *Clarion* of January 3, 1908.

new form of machine is laid down it does supersede the manual labour which was previously employed. Experience, however, proves that before long, as the result of the cheaper production, there follows an increased demand for the manufactured article. In this way machinery, so far from permanently displacing labour, has repeatedly proved itself to be the means of providing additional employment.

With regard to machinery we must deal with our point in stages. The first stage is that machinery cheapens the cost of production, and, in the vast majority of cases, consequently increases the demand for the goods.

Mr. A. Maurice Low, in an exceedingly able chapter dealing with the condition of the industrial classes in the United States of America, writes: "One explanation of the greater productivity of the American working-man . . . is the greater use of machinery, and it has been shown that *only in a country where the rate of wages is high, is it economical to use machinery.*" [1]

". . . The history of American industry affords convincing proof that *the use of the most improved types of machinery, and the most highly specialised and best paid labour, results not in increasing the cost, but, on the contrary, in decreasing it.*" [2]

Again, writes Mr. Maurice Low, "The more extensively machinery enters into manufacturing processes *the lower the cost to the consumer. Therefore, machinery increases wages and cheapens production, so that the labourer obtains a double benefit* by receiving a

[1] *Protection in the United States*, p. 75.
[2] P. 71.

greater reward for his labour and having to spend less for the necessaries of life. . . ."[1]

We now reach the next stage. "Cheap goods!" cry the Socialists; "what do they mean but cheap labour?" And into this pitfall Mr. Blatchford tumbles headlong.

"Now cheap goods mean cheap labour, and cheap labour means low wages."[2]

Let us imagine an industry. Manual labour is employed and the question of the introduction of machinery is under consideration. The machinery and its installation is, however, a costly business. Unless, then, the wages that are paid are high, it will, in all probability, not pay the employer to introduce that machinery. Having done so, however, he finds that his output is enormously increased, and the cost *pro ratâ* decreased. How is he to create an equivalent increase in the demand? He arrives at that by cheapening the sale price of his product, which the lower relative cost permits of his doing. Very quickly he finds that a large increase must be made in the numbers he employs for the purpose of meeting the increased demand on the part of the consumer. Had, indeed, such not been the almost universal result of the use of machinery during the last fifty years, what, we wonder, would have been the state of employment when regard is had to the great increase in the population of Great Britain?

An ounce of fact is, we submit, worth a ton of

[1] P. 74. The subject is too complex to attempt to enter upon in detail here. Reference should be made to chapter v. of Mr. Low's book, pp. 59–78, in which the author demonstrates the connection between a high standard of wages and a low cost of production.

[2] *Merrie England*, p. 92.

Socialist assertion. The following evidence, given before the American Industrial Commission, shows that cheap labour means high wages.

Owing to American imports of gunny cloth cutting out the Indian manufacturer in his own home market, the manager of a large Calcutta factory travelled to the United States in order to ascertain, if possible, the reason.

On going over a great factory in Brooklyn, U.S.A., the Calcutta manager saw the great looms working with one man to the loom. "How much," he asked, "does that man earn?" "$1.50 a day," was the reply (*i.e.* about 6s. 3d.). "Why, the weavers in Calcutta only earn 12½ cents" (*i.e.* about 7d.) "a day. I do not understand it. How do you explain it?" The American manager replied, "What is the cost of weaving in Calcutta a yard of gunny cloth at 12½ cents a day?" "2½ cents a yard" (*i.e.* about 1¼d.), replied the Calcutta manager. The answer of the American manager was: "The cost of weaving on that loom is ½ cent a yard" (*i.e.* ¼d.). "Well," said the Calcutta manager, suddenly enlightened, "I have come half-way around the world to find out what a d——d fool I have been."[1]

For a more detailed inquiry into this subject, reference should be made to chapters v. and xii. of Mr. Low's most able work, *Protection in the United States*. The matter is *in no sense one of fiscal controversy. That cheap labour means cheap production is accepted as a fallacy now by both Protectionists and Free Traders in the States.* "The cheapest labour is the

[1] See *Protection in the United States*, by Mr. A. Maurice Low, pp. 154 and 155. Published by P. S. King & Son, London.

labour which is the most productive, *irrespective of first cost*,"[1] that is, irrespective of the amount which the artisan receives as wages.

Investors' Profits

A fertile source of Socialist denunciation is the share of the product taken by the owner of a business.

Income from capital *apart from risk* is, in Great Britain, about 3 per cent. per annum. Of what the owner "obtains beyond 3 per cent.," wrote John Stuart Mill, "a great part is insurance against the manifold losses to which he is exposed, and cannot be safely applied to his own use, but requires to be kept in reserve to cover those losses when they recur. The remainder is properly the remuneration of his skill and industry—the wages of his labour of superintendence."[2]

Mr. Mill emphasises much the same precepts in his *Principles of Economy* :—

"The rate of profit greatly exceeds the rate of interest. The surplus is partly compensation for risk. By lending his capital on unexceptionable security, he (the owner) runs little or no risk. But *if he embarks in business on his own account, he always exposes his capital to some, and in many cases to very great, danger of partial or total loss.* For this danger he must be compensated, *otherwise he will not incur* it.

[1] *Protection in the United States*, p. 65.

[2] Chapters on Socialism by J. S. Mill, published in *The Fortnightly Review*, 1879. Quoted by Professor Woolsey, *Communism and Socialism*, p. 197.

He must likewise be remunerated for the devotion of his time and labour." [1]

Socialists expatiate at length on the huge profits of certain industrial owners, but are never heard in this connection to refer to the very large number who "go under," *and not only make no profit, but lose all the capital they have embarked in the business.*

Mr. Mallock in his *Labour and the Popular Welfare* quotes an official return published in the year 1889, which showed that of all the companies formed between 1862 and 1889 in this country, *considerably more than one-half had been wound up judicially.*[2]

It is significant, too, that during the year 1907 no fewer than 1531 Limited Companies were wound up. A perusal of Kemp's *Mercantile Gazette* will furnish an abundance of evidence as to the risks which capital runs. These risks, as already enforced, will not be incurred if the State is to be permitted to force the industrial leaders to play, "Heads I (the State) win, tails you lose."

"The profits earned by employers are not great *if averaged over the whole of the industries of the country,*" writes Mr. W. H. Lever, M.P., one of the great industrial leaders of the present day.

"If we include those undertakings which, instead of making profits, are making losses, and take the average over all, *I venture to say that employers as a body would make more money as managers under a system of fixed salaries than under the present system, and that the production of goods would not be cheaper, but dearer,* under the system advocated by Socialists. . . ." [3]

[1] Book II., chapter xv., section 1.
[2] See *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, p. 268.
[3] *The Magazine of Commerce*, October 1907, p. 78.

While the Socialist depreciates the ability of the controllers of industry, he has nothing but wrathful indignation for the investor. He demands a justification "in equity" for the fact that mere money under investment is a substitute for labour. The investor, indeed, to the Socialist's thinking is the parasite who preys upon the men who toil.

It never seems to occur to the Socialist that, in many cases, the money invested represents merely the savings of labour (whether mental or manual) which has been endured. Moreover, the rate of interest enjoyed in this way is always by Socialists grossly exaggerated. In this connection Mr. Mallock emphasises how impossible it is for an investor to obtain a high rate of interest from capital invested in some undertaking *not* directly managed or superintended by the investor, *except* by the exercise of very considerable knowledge and judgment. The instances of the gambler's good luck, on which the Socialist chiefly dwells, are in practice so remote as to merely constitute the exception to the rule.

The investor who, in a business *not* under his own control or superintendence, achieves success, owes it accordingly, in the vast majority of cases, to an exercise of sagacity *beneficial not merely to the individual, but to the community at large, in that he helps to direct human exertion into profitable industrial channels.*[1]

[1] See *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, pp. 266–268.

Does it follow that because Private Enterprise succeeds, State Management will also produce a Profit?

Socialist speakers habitually point to the large profits which certain individual privately-owned industries are earning, and say to their audiences: "If this had been State-owned, these profits would have been yours, and *not* limited to a few individuals."

Such a statement postulates that because private management produced a profit, the same would undoubtedly be the case under State supervision. Experience proves that this is *not* so. Also that private enterprise can frequently convert into a successful undertaking a business which, under State administration, has proved a partial, if not a total, failure.

The Ceylon Pearl Fisheries Company furnishes a good example of this latter fact.

"Under the management of the Government the pearl fishing was a loss; the oyster-beds were not scientifically treated, and rings and knock-outs made the pearl auctions a farce. As soon as the business was transferred to a (private) company, science and capital were applied to the treatment of the beds, and the auctions conducted on proper lines."[1]

The result is that this company is now paying a dividend per annum on its ordinary shares of 20 per cent., and on its deferred shares of 75 per cent. (*i.e.* fifteen shillings on every pound of deferred capital).

Such a history would in no way deter the ordinary

[1] *The Saturday Review*, October 19, 1907.

Socialist speaker from telling his audience: "Look! here is 75 per cent. a year being paid in dividends. Turn out the present proprietors, put me in as your manager, and, hey presto! the 75 per cent. goes into your pockets."

Private Property is not the Enemy

Another favourite Socialist allegation is that mankind in their primitive condition were equal, free, prosperous, and virtuous, and that poverty, misery, and vice generally are directly traceable to the introduction of private property.

This assertion is really borrowed from the theories of Rousseau. These doctrines, owing to sociology then being in its infancy, naturally obtained during the eighteenth century very considerable popularity. This popularity, moreover, they have to a large extent retained.

Every generation, as the Roman poet, Horace, pointed out nearly two thousand years ago, delights in beatifying a past age and in censuring its own.

The study of savage tribes to-day proves this theory, which the Socialists propound, to be entirely false and without foundation. The unpicturesque reality is that they were enslaved, tyrannised over, subject to plague and to famines at frequent intervals, and that moral codes were conspicuous chiefly by their absence.

Even Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P., goes far towards refuting this favourite Socialist theory of retrogression. For, in his recently-published *From Serfdom to Socialism*, he writes: ". . . In our own country

the boundaries of freedom have been widening with the progress of the ages. The slave of a thousand years ago, with no more right than the swine he tended, has fought his way upward through Serfdom to Citizenship. The modern workman is theoretically the equal in the eye of the law of every other class. His vote carries equal weight in the ballot-box with that of the millionaire who employs him ; he is as free to worship when and how he pleases as the noblest baron ; *his rights are in all respects the same as theirs.*" [1]

[1] *From Serfdom to Socialism*, p. 91.

X

SOCIALISM AND RELIGION

Atheism the Aim of Socialism

That Atheism correctly represents the attitude of Socialism with regard to religion has repeatedly been enforced by the greatest leaders of Socialism.

Boruttau, at one time a prominent leader of International Socialism, and formerly, it is believed, editor of the *Volksstaat*, in 1871 described Socialism as "a new view of the world, which, *in the department of religion, expresses itself as Atheism;* in that of politics, as Republicanism; in that of economy, as Communism."[1]

Bebel, one of the greatest of the international leaders of Socialism, or possibly at the present time *the* most world-famed of its leaders, has summed up the chief aims of Socialism in much the same language: "We aim in the domain of politics at Republicanism; in the domain of economics, at Socialism; *and in the domain of what is to-day called religion, at Atheism.*"[2]

Especially instructive is the following statement

[1] See Prof. Woolsey's *Communism and Socialism*, p. 247.

[2] Dawson's *Lassalle and German Socialism*, p. 286, speech in the Reichstag on March 31, 1881.

from the writings of one of the most pre-eminent of English Socialists.

In the passage here cited Mr. E. Belfort Bax proceeds to amplify the foregoing brief, but none the less explicit, statements as to what are the principal aims of Socialism:—

"Socialism has been well described as a new conception of the world presenting itself in industry as co-operative Communism, in politics as International Republicanism, *in religion as atheistic Humanism*, by which is meant the recognition of social progress as our being's highest end and aim. *The establishment of society on a Socialistic basis would imply the definitive abandonment of all theological cults, since the notion of a transcendent God or semi-divine prophet is but the counterpart and analogue of the transcendent governing class.* So soon as we are rid of the desire of one section of society to enslave another, the dogmas of an effete creed will lose their interest. As the religion of slave industry was Paganism; as the religion of serfage was Catholic Christianity, or Sacerdotalism; as the religion of capitalism is Protestant Christianity, or biblical dogma, so the religion of collective and co-operative industry is Humanism, which is only another name for Socialism.

"There is a party who think to overthrow the current theology by disputation and ridicule. They fail to see that *the theology they detest is so closely entwined with the current mode of production that the two things must stand or fall together.*"[1]

This doctrine to which Mr. Belfort Bax gives expression at the close of the foregoing quotation,

[1] *The Religion of Socialism* (published in 1902), p. 81.

namely, that Christianity and the existing mode of production must stand or fall together, is, it should be noted, one which has received general acceptation on the part of International Socialism. That such is the case will be found to be evidenced by various statements by leading Socialists quoted in the course of this chapter.

It is not without abundant evidence in support of his conclusion that the great critic of Socialism, Dr. Schäffle, asserts that ". . . Social Democracy has *ex cathedrâ* avowed Atheism to be its religion. . . ."[1]

In the chapter which treats of the revolutionary nature of Socialism, reference is made to the close identity of principles that exists on the part of Socialism and Anarchism, as evidenced in the masterly analysis of Mr. Rae.[2] Atheism provides yet another of the leading features to be encountered in both Socialism and Anarchism.

Of the Anarchists Mr. Rae writes: "They renounce both God and the devil, and generally with an energy beyond all other revolutionists."[3] This proceeds to a large extent from their refusal to recognise any authority, whether visible or invisible, mundane or supernatural.

Hence, for example, the Anarchist Congress held at Geneva in 1882 in its Manifesto stated: "Our enemy is every abstract authority, whether called devil or Good God, in the name of which priests have so long governed good souls."[4]

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 355.
[2] See as to this, pp. 113–116.
[3] *Contemporary Socialism*, 1901 edition, p. 254.
[4] Quoted by Mr. Rae in *Contemporary Socialism*, 1901 edition, p. 254.

"Socialism of the present day," affirms Dr. Schäffle, "is out and out irreligious and hostile to the Church. It says that the Church is only a police institution for upholding capital, and that it deceives the common people with a 'cheque payable in heaven'; that the Church deserves to perish. The Church, and indeed all religion, is fanatically hated by many Socialists. . . ."[1]

That Dr. Schäffle's foregoing statement is abundantly justified in each and every particular is, it is submitted, sufficiently proved by the Socialist statements recorded in the present chapter, apart altogether from the mass of additional evidence which exists.

Reasons serving to account for the Hostility of Socialism to Religion

The chief reasons which may be assigned as the cause for the vehement hatred of, and hostility towards, Christianity, which in the main distinguish Socialism, are, we believe, three in number.

1. That Socialists consider (and, we think, rightly) that Socialism and Christianity are inherently antagonistic creeds.

2. That Socialism recognises that a belief in a future existence constitutes a powerful obstacle to the accomplishment of its aims. This accrues from the fact that Socialism does, and must always, depend for its success principally on the existence and promotion of the most bitter discontent and dissatisfaction.

[1] *The Quintessence of Socialism*, translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 116.

3. That Socialism, by reason of its cosmopolitan nature and ambitions, wishes to be freed from connection with any one religion, as directly calculated to impede its international acceptance.

With each of these three reasons we propose here to deal in some detail. It is first, however, necessary to emphasise that these three reasons by no means exhaust the points of conflict which exist between Socialism and religion.

Professor Flint, for example, instances the four following points of antagonism between Socialism and Christianity. In so doing, Professor Flint indicates in each case at some length the reasons why in these several respects Socialism and Christianity must necessarily be found to contravene one another.

"First, then, Socialism is antagonistic to Christianity in so far as it rests on, or allies itself with, Atheism or Materialism. . . ."

"Secondly, Socialism is antagonistic to Christianity, inasmuch as it assumes that man's chief end is merely a happy social life on earth. . . ."

"Thirdly, Socialism comes into conflict with Christianity inasmuch as it attaches more importance to the condition of men than to their character, whereas Christianity lays the chief stress on character. . . ."

"Fourthly, Socialism is antagonistic to Christianity in so far as it does injustice to the rights of individuality. . . ." [1]

In regard to the first reason to which we have referred as tending in part to account for the

[1] See *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, pp. 460–465.

antagonism of Socialism to Christianity, viz., that Socialists consider that Socialism and Christianity are inherently antagonistic creeds—the following words of Professor Flint are deserving, in this connection, of attention :—

"For the vast majority of Socialists and anti-Socialists religion means practically Christianity. It is only in that form that they know it, or feel any interest in it. Christianity is the only religion which confronts Socialism as a formidable rival and foe. It is the only religion which Socialists feel it necessary steadily and zealously to combat. All modern Socialism has grown up within Christendom, and is the product of causes which have operated there. With comparatively few exceptions, its adherents may be reckoned among 'the lapsed masses' of Christendom." [1]

The foregoing sufficiently explains, apart altogether from other reasons, why Christianity is *the* religion of all others against which Socialists inveigh.

But why, it might well be asked by those who have paid but little attention to the Socialist campaign, should Socialism regard any religion as its antagonist ?

The reply to such a question may be based on various reasons. For the moment the following passage from Professor Flint's writings serves briefly to explain the *raison d'être* for the antagonism of Socialism to religion :—

"The doctrine of Social Democracy is based on a materialistic conception of the world. Its advocates assail belief in God and immortality as not only in

[1] *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, p. 447.

itself superstition, but as a chief obstacle to the reception of their teaching and the triumph of their cause." [1]

How exceedingly bitter is the enmity felt by Socialism to religion is made clear by the following statement from so incontestable an authority as the *Sozial Demokrat*, the official organ of the German Socialist Party.

This journal, in its issue of May 25, 1880, thus explicitly and authoritatively summed up the attitude of Socialism to Christianity :—

"*As a matter of simple fact, it must be candidly avowed, Christianity is the bitterest foe of Social Democracy.* Just as so utterly dunderheaded a religion as Christianity could only strike root at all two thousand years ago in a humanity that had completely degenerated, so ever since its efforts have always been directed, not, as one might suppose, to rid the world of misery and destitution, but rather to use them for its ends, and as a cloak for its other vices and enormities.

"When God is driven out of the brains of men, the whole system of privilege by the grace of God comes to the ground, and *when heaven hereafter is recognised as a big lie, men will attempt to establish heaven here. Therefore whoever assails Christianity assails, at the same time, monarchy and capitalism.*" [2]

In the foregoing passage it will be noted that not only is Christianity openly proclaimed to be "the bitterest foe" of Socialism, but, even more important, emphasis is laid on the doctrine that

[1] *Socialism*, p. 441.

[2] *L'Internationale Rouge*, by Dr. Zacher. Translated by the Rev. E. M. Geldart, p. 22.

if Socialism is ever to triumph, the belief in a heaven hereafter must be annihilated. Further, there is the clear injunction that to assail Christianity is to assail both monarchy and capitalism, and *vice versâ*.

In fact, we again here encounter the doctrine to which Mr. Belfort Bax gives utterance (see p. 337, *supra*), namely, that the present system of production, capitalism, or by whatever other name it may be designated, must (according to Socialist teaching) stand or fall with Christianity.

Nor is it only in Great Britain and in Germany that Socialism has propounded this dogma.

M. Gabriel Deville, for many years one of the ablest exponents of Socialism in France, in the following striking passage thus emphasised the essential need for the destruction of religion in order that Socialism may attain its objects.

According to Deville, the true source of the religious sentiment is the misery that grows out of capitalism. Hence "the emancipation of thought is thus linked to the emancipation of labour. . . . The terrestrial despot, the capitalist, will drag down in his fall the heavenly monster of imagination. . . . The belief in a Supreme Being, sovereign dispenser of happiness and suffering, will universally disappear." Religion, M. Deville proceeds to describe as an "engine of domination," "one of the most useful springs in a government of caste." [1]

Here again, it will be observed, we are once more confronted with the Socialist doctrine that the present

[1] See Professor Lecky's *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 348.

industrial system is fatally linked with the Christian creed—that the destruction of the one *cannot* be accomplished without the necessary destruction of the other. To overcome and to annihilate the terrestrial despot—under which category Socialists habitually include all who possess any wealth whatsoever—all belief in a Deity, styled by Deville the heavenly monster (French, *Le Croquemitaine Céleste*) must, and will, be irretrievably shattered. On a basis of triumphant Atheism there is then to be erected the Socialist State.

In Great Britain we again find that leaders of the Socialist movement have explicitly affirmed the inherent impossibility of Socialism and Christianity co-existing.

Speaking in Nottingham as recently as October 23, 1907, Mr. Harry Quelch, one of the leading members of the Social Democratic Federation of Great Britain, thus expressed himself:—

". . . Whatever might be said on the question, it seemed to him that *Christianity and Socialism were absolutely incompatible.*" [1]

The proposition that a life and death struggle between Christianity and Socialism must precede the dawn of the Socialist era has been repeatedly advanced by Socialists.

Such a prognostication appears to us to be based only on inherent probabilities, once the nature of the issues becomes more generally recognised by those who are opposed to Socialism, and who are not prepared to renounce all belief in religion.

In the *Clarion* of October 4, 1907, Mr. Robert

[1] *The Nottingham Daily Express*, October 24, 1907.

Blatchford emphasises that, in his opinion, a conflict between the two forces cannot be avoided.

". . . I took my own course years ago. Believing that the Christian religion was untrue, and believing that all supernatural religions were inimical to human progress, and *foreseeing that a conflict between Socialism and religion* (so-called) *was inevitable, I attacked the Christian religion. . . . It had to be done, and it will have to be finished. No half-and-half measures will serve.* . . . I believe that I did right, and I believe that I did wisely. . . ."

Professor Karl Pearson, a leading English Socialist writer, and, indeed, one of Socialism's most distinguished disciples, emphasises in the following passages the vast gulf which separates Christianity and Socialism:—

"I have spoken of Socialism as a recognised movement, but it is essentially necessary to mark the characteristics which distinguish it from other political movements of this century. The difference lies in the fact that *the new polity is based upon a conception of morality differing in toto from the current Christian ideal, which it does not hesitate to call anti-social and immoral.* . . . As the old religious faith breaks up, a new basis of morals is required more consonant with the reasoning spirit of the age. . . . *The modern Socialistic theory of morality is based upon the agnostic treatment of the supersensuous. Man,* in judging of conduct, *is concerned only with the present life; he has to make it as full and as joyous as he is able,* and to do this consciously and scientifically with all the knowledge of the present, and all the experience of the past, pressed into his service. *Not from fear*

of hell, not from hope of heaven, from no love of a tortured man-god, but solely for the sake of society. . . . *Can a greater gulf be imagined than really exists between current Christianity and the Socialistic code?* Socialism arises from the recognition (1) that the sole aim of mankind is happiness in this life . . . current Christianity is not a vivifying political force; *current Christianity is the direct outcome of a pessimistic superstition, and can never be legitimately wedded to a Hellenic rationalism."* [1]

The Parliamentary by-election which took place in the Kirkdale Division of Liverpool on September 27, 1907, tended to provide added evidence of the connection which exists between Atheism and Socialism.

On the personal admission of Socialists, that election was utilised by the Socialist party in promoting the spread of Atheism, and in subverting the Christian religion.

In an article in the *Labour Leader*, the weekly organ of the Independent Labour Party, of October 4, 1907, Mr. J. Bruce Glasier, a prominent English Socialist of many years' standing, writes:—

" . . . We could not affirm (at the Kirkdale by-election) that the book containing Mr. Blatchford's attack on Christianity was not sold at Socialist meetings. Our enemy knew that. We could not deny that a special edition of the *Clarion*—an edition containing Mr. Hill's election address, and filled chiefly with articles on Socialism from Mr. Blatchford's writings—had been distributed from the Labour committee rooms; and *this was the paper,*

[1] "The Moral Basis of Socialism," published in *The Ethic of Freethought*, pp. 318 and 319.

and Mr. Blatchford was the writer, who had been engaged for months in attacking Christianity. We could not deny that leaflets on Socialism bearing advertisements of that paper were being circulated at our meetings. We could not, I say, deny these things, and therefore *we could not well declare that our Socialist propaganda was in no sense responsible for circulating Mr. Blatchford's anti-religious credo.*"

At the council meeting of the Independent Labour Party, held on October 4 and 5, 1907, the following resolution was (*inter alia*) adopted:—

"The National Council of the Independent Labour Party repudiates the attack upon Socialism on the ground that Socialism is opposed to religion, and declares that the Socialist movement embraces men and women of all religions and forms of belief, and offers the most complete freedom in this respect within its ranks." [1]

Unless words are to be accounted a surer indication of the doctrines of a party than their actions, what possible value, we would ask, can attach to such a resolution as this in view of the foregoing?

What occurred at the Kirkdale by-election was no isolated instance of the anti-Christian nature of the Socialist campaign. In referring to "an open-air address for an I.L.P. branch in Scotland," Mr. J. Bruce Glasier in the same number of the *Labour Leader* (October 4, 1907) further describes how on that occasion he had to "*acknowledge that the assertion that Socialism and Atheism were in some instances associated could not be denied.* 'I cannot deny that, even if I would,' I said, 'for what do I see here, and

[1] *The Labour Leader*, October 18, 1907.

what does my audience see? Look at the bookstall there, which my comrades have kindly honoured me by erecting under my platform, and you will find a display of *God and my Neighbour*,[1] as well as Haeckel's *Riddle of the Universe* and other Rationalist Press publications, *attacking God and Christianity, whereas you will not find a single book attacking Atheism and Agnosticism.*'"

Again we would ask how the Independent Labour Party deems it compatible with its above-cited resolution to translate and to circulate a work such as that, which to-day forms No. "1" of the "Socialist Library," viz., Professor Ferri's work, translated into English under the title of *Socialism and Positive Science*. In the translation published by the Independent Labour Party we encounter, for example, the statement that Socialism "tends to substitute itself for religion . . ."[2]

It is perfectly true that the English translation opens with a Preface by Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, M.P., in which Mr. Macdonald writes (*inter alia*): "In common with most Marxian Socialists, Ferri attacks religion and capitalism, marriage (as we know it), and private property in the means of production, in the same breath. The Socialist movement in this country has not only not considered these attacks to be essential to the success of Socialism, but has largely disagreed with them."[3]

With these words we leave the Independent Labour Party in this country to justify their own transparent inconsistencies.

[1] The author of this is Mr. Robert Blatchford, the editor of the Socialist *Clarion*.

[2] P. 49.

[3] Preface, p. vi.

Incidental reference has already been made to the fact that the connection between the *Clarion* and unbelief was raised at the Kirkdale by-election.

The journal in question, by way of reply, took up an even more outspoken attitude in regard to this matter. Nothing was withdrawn. Indeed, on the contrary, Mr. Blatchford, in an article beneath his own signature, published in the *Clarion* of October 4, 1907, entitled—

"THE *CLARION*

POLITICAL SAGACITY, POLITICAL HONESTY

THE IMPURITY OF THE PRESS

AND THE FATAL LEAFLET"

wrote as follows :—

"But upon this last—the religious question—to hedge will be to court defeat. Upon this question the Socialists and the Labourists will be compelled to make a plain pronouncement.

"My way is to hoist the Jolly Roger and fire a broadside. But the Labour Party cannot adopt my way, because, upon the subject of religion, they are not unanimous.

"So the only policy that seems open to them is to repudiate me, and to declare that religion and Atheism are no more parts of the Labour policy than they are parts of the Liberal and Tory policy.

"And I don't believe that such a declaration will save them.

"So now the sagacious ones will declare that I have done great harm to the movement, and have put back the cause for many years.

"Well. Perhaps that is true. But it had to be done, and it will have to be finished. No half-and-half measures will serve. The man who 'could not swallow that leaflet,' the man who voted Tory because one Socialist was not a Christian, cannot be parleyed with. He must be converted. And he is typical of millions. *The Labour men who will not attack the so-called religions* because they are Christians are in the same position as the workers who will not join the Socialist Party because they are Radicals. They *will have to be converted.*

"No. In the matter of religion the Labour Party is between the devil and the deep sea. They cannot hoist the Christian standard, for a great many of them are not Christians; they cannot hoist the Agnostic standard, because a great many of them *are* Christians. They cannot wipe me out and bury the whole question, for I decline to be wiped out, and their political enemies will forbid the funeral.

"All my fault? Yes. I'm afraid it is, or most of it. But I believe that I did right, and I believe that I did wisely, and I believe that the Socialism that will finally triumph will be the Socialism of *Not Guilty* and of *News from Nowhere.*

"I believe that if the Labour Party fought Kirkdale over again, upon sagacious lines, they would be again defeated. And I believe that if they fought it upon my lines they would win.

"In the meantime the Labour Party had better explain that I have no authority to speak for Socialism, and am not a representative Socialist, and that Mr. Hill did not write *God and my Neighbour.*

"As for me, I think I had better prepare to smite the enemies of Socialism.

"Behold, my friends, allied against you are the Christian, the sweater, the moneylender, the land-grabber, the journalistic professional liar and purveyor of moral filth, and the man with the muck-rake. They will attack you as enemies of God and of the British hearth. What are you going to do about it?

"I think I can see what I am going to do about it. I am going to do what Peachey did when surrounded by enemies in Kafiristan; I am going to 'fire into the brown of 'em.' The people must be saved from themselves. They must be taught to think. Boy, run up to the fore-peak, and nail the Jolly Roger to the mast.

"The Protestants, the Nonconformists, the Roman Catholics and their votes, the Press, the public morals, and the sanctity of the home! I can see I shall be kept busy in my old age."

Materialism the Gospel of Socialism

Were it not for the fact that, in respect of Socialism, all things are possible, it would have been here deemed superfluous to adduce evidence in support of the proposition that one of the "basic principles," to use Mr. Keir Hardie's phrase, of Socialism is ultra-Materialism. That such is the case, we submit, is sufficiently demonstrated by the following.

Mr. Thomas Kirkup, in referring to the doctrines put forward by the late Karl Marx, usually admitted to be the founder of modern Socialism, states: "The entire legal and political structure, as well

as philosophy and religion, are constituted and controlled in accordance with the economic basis. . . . *His* (Marx's) *conception of the world is a frank and avowed Materialism.*" [1]

For our part it appears extraordinary that any one should have sought to identify Christianity with a creed which is of the earth earthy and materialistic in the extreme.

In making this statement we are, of course, prepared for the common retort as to the connection as proved by the existence of Christian Socialist societies. But does such a fact, after all, prove anything at all? In referring to one of the most prominent of Christian Socialists in this country, Professor Flint thus effectively disposes of so shallow an argument: "Mr. Headlam," writes Professor Flint, "believes in a Socialism which aims at robbery on a gigantic scale, and in a religion which forbids all dishonesty. What does that prove? That Socialism and Christianity are closely akin? No! Only that Mr. Headlam, like all other men, may regard incompatible things as consistent." [2]

As regards the second of the reasons stated above, as serving to account for the hostility of Socialism to religion, viz., that Socialism recognises that a belief in a future existence constitutes a powerful obstacle to the accomplishment of its aims—it may surely be regarded as axiomatic that profound resentment against the existing system correctly represents the attitude of Socialism. This, we submit, is the case whether the present system be regarded from a moral, economic, or industrial standpoint.

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 151. [2] *Socialism*, p. 438.

Dissatisfaction, rancour, and discontent must, if Socialism is ever to receive the support of a majority, be fostered and increasingly augmented. Hence the Socialist gospel of "the class war." Christianity, in lieu of seeking to promote these essentials to the accomplishment of Socialism, tends, on the contrary, to allay them. Life in this world, according to the teaching of *all* Christian creeds (so we believe), represents but a transient passage towards an eternal and happier existence. Again, "the Christian Church means for the people Equality before God. . . ."[1]

All of such characteristics inherent to Christianity tend to militate against the success of Socialism.

Socialism has not been slow to realise that by rooting out and totally destroying all belief in a future and happier existence, as Christianity inculcates, the desire to obtain the best that this world can offer is freed from an important rival.

As states Professor Lecky: ". . . When the hope of a future world no longer supplies a vivid and strongly realised consolation amidst the miseries of life, it is not surprising that the desire to obtain the best things of this world should attain a passionate force."[2]

Hence it follows that Socialists "cry down all 'bills drawn on heaven,' and, of course, equally on hell,"[3] and that we find Mr. Blatchford asserting: "I do not believe there is any heaven, and I scorn the idea of hell" (*Clarion*, September 23, 1904).

"*Socialism arises from the recognition that the sole*

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, by Dr. Schäffle, p. 354.
[2] *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 497.
[3] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, by Dr. Schäffle, p. 36.

aim of mankind is happiness in this life; . . ." so declares Professor Karl Pearson[1] in the passage previously here quoted.

The aims and designs of Socialism in regard to religion are thus clearly exposed to view through the powerful pen of M. Émile de Laveleye: ". . . By annihilating all hope of a future life, where unalloyed bliss would compensate for the fleeting trials of this world, it" (*i.e.* Socialism regarded in its character of Atheistic Materialism) "instigates the masses to overturn the established social system, in order, amidst the general ruin, to gain possession of wealth and the material joys that wealth can provide. It is, therefore, evident that *those who desire a violent social revolution are interested in spreading Atheism, and that those who spread this doctrine are furnishing the revolutionary Socialists with arms.*

"Christianity preaches the common brotherhood of all men, the mutual love and equality of all; it honours labour because labour alone gives man a chance to live; it reinstates the poor man and denounces the rich idler. There is, therefore, no more solid foundation for the demand of reforms on behalf of the disinherited classes.

"*And yet Social Democracy repudiates it, and tries to crush it, because, by opening up the prospect of a future life, it tends to make men resigned to the ills of the present one. No doctrine is more calculated than Atheistic Materialism to inflame the hearts of working-men with rage and hatred against the system of society which determines their present condition,* and therefore it is

[1] "The Moral Basis of Socialism." Published in *The Ethics of Freethought*, p. 319.

that the apostles of anarchical revolution adopt and propagate it as their gospel."[1]

In the passage following we find emphasised on behalf of Socialism most, if not all, of the very points to which M. de Laveleye has here referred:—

"*The disappearance of the faith in something beyond,* . . ." writes Professor Ferri, a leading Italian Socialist, "*gives more vigour to the desire of a little 'terrestrial paradise' down here* for the unhappy and the less fortunate. . . . On this side, again, *Socialism* is joined to religious evolution, and *tends to substitute itself for religion, because it desires precisely that humanity should have in itself its own 'terrestrial paradise,' without having to wait for it in a 'something beyond,' which, to say the least, is very problematical.*"

Later Signor Ferri, in the same work, proceeds to state: "It is because Socialism knows and foresees that religious beliefs . . . must waste away before the extension of even elementary scientific culture; it is for that reason that Socialism does not feel the necessity of fighting specially these same religious beliefs which are destined to disappear. It has taken this attitude, even though *it knows that the absence, or lessening, of the belief in God is one of the most powerful factors in its extension.* . . ."[2]

To the third reason previously set forth as tending to account for the antagonism of Socialism to Christianity, viz., that Socialism, by reason of its cosmopolitan nature and ambitions, wishes to be freed from connection with any one religion, as

[1] *The Socialism of To-Day.* Translated by Mr. Goddard H. Orpen, pp. 125 and 126.

[2] *Socialism and Positive Science,* pp. 48–51. Translated by Miss E. C. Harvey, and published by the Independent Labour Party, London.

directly calculated to impede its international acceptance—far less importance, in our opinion, attaches than to the two former reasons.

That such, however, is not without its influence in fomenting hostility on the part of Socialism to Christianity, we regard as certain. Evidence thereof exists not only among the writings of Continental, but also of English, Socialists.

In the following passage Mr. Belfort Bax sets out to justify the impossibility of Socialism associating itself with Christianity, and the hostility borne by the former to the latter :—

"To say nothing of the thousands in Europe to whom the name Christian is positively abhorrent, how shall they face the Eastern world when the time comes for so doing? Only those who can tell the Moslem, the Buddhist, the Confucian, we care not for Jesus of Nazareth any more than for Mohammed, for Gautama, or for Kon-fu-tze . . . will ever obtain the ear of the Orient, and never they who come in *the hated and blood-stained name of Christianity*—name indicative of racial and religious rivalry."[1]

Socialism its own Religion

Not only is Socialism essentially atheistical, according to the avowals of many of its own supporters, but it is also inherently materialistic. Atheism sums up the negative side of Socialism in regard to religion; Materialism its positive side. The political creed of Socialism represents also its religious gospel.

This aspect of Socialism has been carefully

[1] *Ethics of Socialism*, p. 54.

considered by Professor Flint in his admirable analysis of Socialism and Religion.[1]

"Saint-Simon," writes Professor Flint, "closed his career with presenting his social doctrine as a new Christianity . . . and on this New Christianity, Enfantin and his adherents sought to raise the New Church of the future. Fourier, Considérant, Cabet, and Leroux all felt that society could not be held together, reinvigorated and reorganised by mere reasoning and science, but required also the force and life which faith and religion can alone impart. At the same time, like Saint-Simon, they regarded historical Christianity as effete, and sought to discover substitutes for it capable of satisfying both the natural and spiritual wants of man. The great aim of Auguste Comte, from 1847 until his death in 1857, was so to transform his philosophy into a religion that it would be adequate to the task of organising and regulating all the activities and institutions of humanity. In Germany Fr. Feuerbach, Josiah Dietzgen, Dr. Stamm, Julius Stern, and others have presented substantially the same views."[2]

Similar views also have been propounded on behalf of Socialism in this country.

"*It*" (Socialism), writes Mr. Belfort Bax, "*utterly despises the 'other world'* with all its stage properties —that is, the present objects of religion."

In place of existing religions, Socialism, so we learn from Mr. Bax, would substitute its own. "*It is in the hope and the struggle for this higher social life . . . that the Socialist finds his ideal, his religion. . . . The*

[1] See *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, chapter xi.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 430 and 431.

Socialist, whose social creed is his only religion, requires no travesty of Christian rites to aid him in keeping his ideal before him."[1]

It must, on reflection, surely be evident that if religion with its accompanying belief in a hereafter is to be destroyed, something must be set up in place of it. Such is one of the lessons taught by the great French Revolution of 1789. What could be simpler? In place of a heaven allocated to a period after death, Socialism (if we accept its own assertions) substitutes a heaven *at once open to all*, provided only the Socialist *régime* pass from the realms of theory into practice.

As "Nemo" has shrewdly observed, Mahomet gained his power by promising to his followers a Paradise in heaven, whilst Socialists hope to attain their ends by promising to each and all a Paradise on earth.[2]

The reason, then, why Socialists, in regard to both the past and present, are such bitter pessimists, and in regard to the future such unbounded optimists, needs no further to be sought after.

That Atheism is, and always has, constituted one of the principal features of International Socialism has been repeatedly proved.

Evidence thereof has already been incidentally forthcoming during the course of the present chapter. It is with the Socialism of this country, however, that we are more immediately concerned.

In his history of *Socialism in England* Mr. Sidney Webb, the English Socialist writer, observes: "It is true that many prominent Socialists are Agnostics

[1] *The Religion of Socialism*, pp. 52 and 53.
[2] See *A Reply to Merrie England*, p. 21.

or Atheists, but the same remark could be made of every reform movement." [1]

Mr. Belfort Bax goes considerably further. This writer, in fact, glories in "the long array of anti-Christian names," [2] which is furnished by the list of Socialism's greatest leaders, dating back from the end of the eighteenth century down to the present day. Mr. Bax, in the same passage, ridicules the possibility of citing among such leaders the names of any who have been avowedly Christian.

"The greatest and most influential name in the history of Socialism," writes Mr. Kirkup, "is unquestionably Karl Marx." [3]

That Marx was a pronounced Atheist is abundantly evidenced by his writings. Confirmation on this point is to be met with in the writings of Marx's own son-in-law, Dr. Edward Aveling, who states: "Marx was an avowed Atheist." [4]

This attachment on the part of Marx to Atheism has not been without the most important results.

Holding as he did intensely to Atheism, it is not surprising that Marx's doctrines developed an ultra-Materialistic tendency.

With the result that Marx's "conception of the world," to quote again Mr. Kirkup's words, took the form of "a frank and avowed Materialism." [5]

Were the Marxian Socialism to be deprived of what are its two leading characteristics, viz., Atheism

[1] *Socialism in England*, 1901 edition, p. 63.
[2] See *The Religion of Socialism*, p. 93.
[3] *History of Socialism*, 1901 edition, p. 130.
[4] See Dr. Aveling's pamphlet, *Charles Darwin and Karl Marx* (Twentieth Century Press), p. 13.
[5] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 151.

and Materialism, it would become wholly unrecognisable. Ethically, it represents the gospel of lust and hatred—"the class war"; economically, the doctrine of Materialism; and politically, a propagandism of expropriation. On Socialism in Great Britain Marx has exercised an influence as great as, if not greater than, in any other country throughout the civilised world.

Reference has already here been made to the connection in England and in Scotland between Atheism and Socialism. If this connection is less intimate or less easily demonstrated in Great Britain than in Continental countries, much of this is traceable to the fact that many English and Scotch Socialists have realised that religious instincts in this country are still too prevalent and too strongly developed to render such an avowal politically opportune as yet. The all-important extent to which political opportunism to-day guides and regulates the action of the leaders of a large section of English Socialism, is abundantly evidenced by the proceedings of the Conference of the Labour Party at Hull in January 1908. (See as to this, p. 34.) Other English Socialists already recognise that it is only for a time that the war between Socialism and religion can be postponed, and that come it inevitably must.

What other deduction than that of political expediency can, for example, be drawn from the Kirkdale by-election, to which allusion has already been made. Here we find English Socialists denouncing as a base slander the imputation that their cause is in any way identified with Atheism; whilst at their

meetings "the book containing Mr. Blatchford's attack on Christianity" was, according to their own admission, being sold. If the active propagation of Atheism is not to be construed as a proof of Atheism, what, we ask, is to be the test ?

That some English Socialists do believe, in the same way as do many Christian Socialists, who are Christians rather than Socialists, that Socialism and Christianity point in the same direction, we should be the last to deny. That such characters are, however, *merely exceptional* is, we submit, the *sole* conclusion that can be drawn from a creed in accord with which burning hatred is, in practice, the disposition chiefly inculcated ; and from a gospel which, in lieu of "on earth peace, goodwill toward men," proclaims "the class war."

It is difficult in most cases to demonstrate with precision the position of leading English Socialists towards religion. Many, if not most, of these today are Atheists. To prove an affirmative is, however, always difficult ; more especially when the only means available are the personal writings or reported speeches of the individual in question. The following statements indicate sufficiently clearly the religious views of some of the most pre-eminent of English Socialist writers and leaders at the present time.

Mr. Robert Blatchford, whom another English Socialist writer describes as one "who has made Socialists by the hundred thousand,"[1] frankly states, in the Preface to his *God and my Neighbour*, "I am an 'Infidel,' and I now ask leave to tell you why."[2]

[1] *The Class War*, by James Leatham (Twentieth Century Press), p. 12.
[2] Preface, p. x.

Mr. Blatchford's concluding words to this same book are: "Let the Holy have their Heaven. I am a man and an Infidel. And this is my Apology. Besides, gentlemen, *Christianity is not true.*"[1]

Mr. Blatchford again repeats this latter statement. "I have been asked why I have opposed Christianity. I have several reasons which shall appear in due course. At present, I offer one. *I oppose Christianity because it is not true.*"[2]

Even more explicit are the following words of Mr. Robert Blatchford, which appeared in the *Clarion* on September 23, 1904:—

"I do not believe that Christianity or Buddhism or Judaism or Mahomedanism is true. I do not believe that any one of these religions is necessary. I do not believe that any one of them affords a perfect rule of life.

"I deny the existence of a Heavenly Father. I deny the efficacy of prayer. I deny the Providence of God. I deny the truth of the Old Testament and the New Testament. I deny the truth of the Gospels. I do not believe any miracle ever was performed. I do not believe that Christ was divine. I do not believe that Christ died for man. I do not believe that He ever rose from the dead. I am strongly inclined to believe that He never existed at all.

"I deny that Christ in any way or in any sense ever interceded for man or saved man or reconciled God to man or man to God. I deny that the love or the help or the intercession of Christ, or Buddha, or Mahomet, or the Virgin Mary is of any use to any man.

[1] *God and my Neighbour*, p. 197. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

"I do not believe there is any Heaven, and I scorn the idea of Hell."

Mr. H. M. Hyndman has thus summarised his own religious views :—

"I have no prejudice against any religion, though I feel a little in the condition of the Emperor of China, who, having examined the three religions of his Empire, issued a rescript telling his people to believe in none of them." [1]

The personal views of Mr. Belfort Bax on the subject of religion are sufficiently evidenced in the various quotations from his writings comprised in the present chapter.

Dr. Edward Aveling, another prominent English Socialist writer and lecturer, in the following passage declares his position in regard to religion :—

"We explained to him that we were Atheists, but did not say there was no God," [2] writes Dr. Aveling of himself and Dr. Büchner in referring to a visit which these latter made on one occasion to the celebrated naturalist, Charles Darwin.

The views of Mr. Bernard Shaw on religion are sufficiently apparent from the following extracts from one of his recent works.

"*At present there is not a single credible established religion in the world.* That is perhaps the most stupendous fact in the whole world-situation." [3]

"Popular Christianity," again writes this same author, "has for its emblem a gibbet; for its chief

[1] Lecture, Queen's Hall, London (April 14, 1904), reprinted under the title of *Social Democracy: The Basis of its Principles and the Causes of its Success*, p. 7.

[2] See Dr. Aveling's pamphlet, *Charles Darwin and Karl Marx*, p. 13.

[3] *Major Barbara*, published 1907, p. 188.

sensation a sanguinary execution after torture ; for its central mystery an insane vengeance bought off by a trumpery expiation." [1]

"And here my disagreement with the Salvation Army, and with all propagandists of the Cross (to which I object as I object to all gibbets) becomes deep indeed. Forgiveness, absolution, atonement," continues Mr. Bernard Shaw, "are figments ; punishment is only a pretence of cancelling one crime by another ; and you can no more have forgiveness without vindictiveness than you can have a cure without a disease." [2]

Christian Socialism

Into the varying doctrines held by Christian Socialist societies it is not proposed here to attempt to enter.

The societies are numerous, and exist in Great Britain, the United States of America, in Germany, France, and, indeed, in most Continental countries.

Some are more Socialist than Christian, while in other instances the name Socialist is altogether a misnomer. Professor Flint has conducted a most exhaustive inquiry into Christian Socialism.

In the following sentence this distinguished writer sums up his conclusion: "*What is called Christian Socialism will always be found either un-Christian in so far as it is Socialistic, or un-Socialistic in so far as it is truly and fully Christian.*" [3]

That the religion of Socialism is essentially Materialistic, and therefore worlds removed from the doctrines

[1] P. 182. [2] P. 171.
[3] *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, p. 441.

of Christianity, has, it is conceived, been sufficiently attested in the earlier portion of this chapter.

As M. Leroy-Beaulieu has well said: "Socialists are hungry and thirsty for the goods of this earth; they do not apply to themselves the maxim of the Gospel. The *Beati pauperes spiritu* is not to their taste."

In so far, then, as these self-designated "Christian Socialist" societies are concerned, let those which are Socialist rather than Christian drop the prefix, and come forth and fight in their true colours.

Whilst as regards those which are Christian rather than Socialist, has not the time already arrived when they should seriously consider the need for a more suitable appellation? Is it not high time that they should cease to afford the support which their existence at present lends to a cause which is in no way deserving of it?

Unfortunately a large section of the public at all times are apt to judge of circumstances by their names only. Such persons, therefore, are accustomed, owing to this interconnection of words, to wholly misconstrue the true nature of Socialism. Herein lies the danger. It is with this aspect of Christian Socialism alone that we are here concerned.

The vast mass of Socialists in every country have no wish whatsoever to be identified with their Christian Socialist allies, *although* glad enough on occasion to utilise the glamour thus cast towards obtaining adherents for revolutionary Socialism.

In Germany, in France, in Great Britain, Socialists have been accustomed to deride the members of the different Christian Socialist organisations, one moment

for not being Christians, the next for not being Socialists.

For example, writes M. Jaurès, one of the great leaders of Socialism in France to-day, in a pamphlet translated by Mr. H. Quelch of the S.D.F.: "No! we are not to be duped by the efforts of the pretended Christian Socialism, of the pretended Christian Social Democracy." "Clericalism," further states M. Jaurès, "is authority, hierarchy. Socialism is co-ordination, the co-operation of equals." [1]

If we turn to Socialism in Great Britain, precisely the same attacks are levelled by the Socialists against the Christian Socialists. Not only this, but the existence of any connection between Christianity and Socialism is explicitly denied by the Socialists.

"Christianity," stated Mr. H. M. Hyndman in a speech delivered at a dinner of the Imperial Industries Club in London as recently as January 13, 1908, "is Anarchism, not Socialism. *There is no word in Christianity about Socialism.*" [2]

With the truth of the latter statement by Mr. Hyndman we most cordially agree.

Again, in speaking at a Socialist meeting at the Holborn Town Hall, London, on January 31, 1908, Mr. Hyndman asserted: Socialism "is the only religion left. Christianity is practically a dead creed." [3]

"Lastly, one word on that singular hybrid, the 'Christian Socialist,'" writes Mr. Belfort Bax; "... *the association of Christianism with any form of Socialism is*

[1] *Socialism*, by Jean Jaurès, pp. 12 and 13. Translated by Mr. H. Quelch.
[2] *The Daily Express*, January 14, 1908.
[3] *Ibid.*, February 1, 1908.

a mystery, rivalling the mysterious combination of ethical and other contradictions in the Christian divinity himself "[1] (*sic*).

The Socialist writer, Mr. James Leatham, expressly affirms that it is the desire of Socialists to be quit of their so-called "Christian Socialist" allies.

"Socialism is grand enough and strong enough to stand without Christian props. It is about as reasonable to speak of Christian Socialism as it would be to speak of Christian arithmetic or Christian geometry."[2]

"To-day we have to settle down to our primers and our programmes, our Blue books and our social experiments," writes the same author, "just as if Jesus had never lived, or, perhaps, all the more because he (*sic*) lived."[3]

Again, asserts Mr. Leatham, "*So far, indeed, from Christianity being able to support Socialism, it goes hard with Christianity to stand by itself.* As a support to Socialism it would surely prove a broken reed. . . . *Let us make a stand against this persistent hankering after a Christian sanction for a system which carries its own sanction* with it, which is its own strength, and its own exceeding great recommendation, if darkeners of counsels would but hold their peace."[4]

Mr. J. Shufflebotham, another Socialist writer in this country, emphasises the absurd inconsistency of yoking Socialism and Christianity together.

"And why some persons will persist in calling themselves Christian Socialists I have not as yet

[1] *The Ethics of Socialism*, p. 52.
[2] *Was Jesus a Socialist?* by James Leatham, p. 13. (The Twentieth Century Press.)
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 16.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 14 and 15.

been able to understand. . . . *I maintain that Socialism has nothing whatever in common with Christianity from the theological* standpoint, and therefore ought not to be introduced in speech or writings." [1]

Again, states the same writer, "It is not necessary for the Socialist to become a Christian, for the Atheist can be just as good a Socialist as the very best Christian." [2]

Mr. Belfort Bax in the following passage proceeds to emphasise in greater detail how opposed really is Socialism to Christianity. So much so is this the case, that Mr. Bax would appear to revel over the discomfiture attending a leading English Christian Socialist, who attempted the impossible task of connecting the chief leaders of the Socialist movement with aught but Atheism.

"A body of High Churchmen, calling themselves the Guild of St. Matthew, held a series of meetings towards the close of the year 1883 for the discussion of this Christian Socialism. It was difficult to obtain any clear notion of what Christian Socialism meant from the ideas set forth by its professed exponents, setting aside the want of unanimity displayed; . . . the worthy Canon" (*i.e.* the Rev. Canon Shuttleworth), "when asked at the close of his address, in proof of an assertion he had made, to furnish the names of any Socialist leaders who could, in any sense, be described as Christian—*against the long array of anti-Christian names, from Marat and Babœuf to Lassalle and Marx*, which were cited against him — could only bring forward those of the astute capitalist

[1] *The Christian, the Atheist, and the Socialist*, p. 3. Published by the Twentieth Century Press. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

co-operators, Leclaire and Godin, as historical evidence of the independent existence of the Christian Socialist." [1]

Would Socialism admit of Religious Freedom?

Few probably will be prepared to dissent from the view that of the many questions which present themselves in connection with a Socialist *régime*, possibly none transcend in importance that which resolves itself into the question, "Will Socialism admit of religious freedom?"

In reply to the question "What will be the probable attitude of the Socialist State towards religion?" Dr. Schäffle is fully convinced that Socialism would *not* tolerate religious freedom.

"I myself do *not* believe," writes Dr. Schäffle, "that Social Democracy would permit freedom to the religious life. It would, of necessity, be far more intolerant than the existing State. *The Paris commune distinctly proved this.* As long as religion remained free, the whole social system of Democratic Collectivism would be threatened with a constant danger. . . . Democratic Socialism is actually, and of inherent necessity, the deadly foe of the Christian Church. . . . *Social Democracy declares that it has no need either of a Church or of any belief.*" [2]

The whole of the evidence already adduced in the present chapter, it is submitted, tends absolutely to corroborate the foregoing deductions at which Dr.

[1] *The Religion of Socialism*, p. 93.
[2] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy.* Translated by Mr. Bosanquet, pp. 167 and 168.

Schäffle, with his world-wide knowledge of Socialism, unhesitatingly arrives. So antagonistic, indeed, is Socialism to Christianity that there is grave reason to believe that its intolerance would extend to an active persecution of all branches of the Christian religion.

Assuming for present purposes, however, that the Socialist State would refrain from totally prohibiting all forms of religion, what in this event would be its probable attitude towards religion?

Mr. O'Brien raises a most important question when he asks: Would Socialism "support every creed that sprang from the fertile brain of fanaticism, *or would it attempt to make a selection, and so inevitably fall into that great vice of all actual and possible governments, viz., favouritism?*"[1]

In this latter case, the action of the Socialist State towards religion would in practice prove scarcely less tyrannical than were it to totally suppress all forms of religion.

So meagre is the constructive side of the policy which Socialism has hitherto propounded, that the *sole* method at present available for arriving at an answer to such questions as are here indicated, consists in examining the present attitude of Socialism towards religion. Deduction is, in fact, the only means to-day available. Such an examination certainly lends no support to the view that those who attach importance to, and value, religion, can, from this standpoint, consistently afford either to support the Socialist policy, or to adopt towards it a mere neutral or passive attitude.

[1] *Socialism Tested by Facts*, by Mr. M. D. O'Brien, p. 116.

Active and unremitting opposition is, indeed, the only course to which the adherents of religion can with safety resort. The increasing strides which Socialism is in this country to-day making render it essential that such opposition should no longer be postponed.

In the *Fabian Essays* Mr. Bernard Shaw informs his readers that "One can see . . . that the inevitable reconstitution of the State Church on a democratic basis may, for example, open up the possibility of the election of an avowed Free-thinker like . . . to the deanery of Westminster." [1]

From this statement it is apparent that State-endowed Atheism may be one of the products of Socialism.

Whether in practice such will result or not, only one course is open at the present time to the supporters of religion compatible with the security of the Faith which they profess. That is to resolutely oppose the realisation of a creed which is, and always has been, mainly identified with Materialism, with Atheism, and which to-day declines to recognise any form of public opinion other than "the will of the majority of the European Socialist Party." [2]

[1] *Fabian Essays*, p. 200.
[2] See *The Ethics of Socialism*, by Mr. Belfort Bax, p. 122.

XI

WOMAN UNDER SOCIALISM

Socialism and Marriage

In considering the position of Woman under Socialism, there first and foremost arises in point of importance the question, "What is to be the attitude of the Socialist State in regard to Marriage?"

As will be conclusively shown in this chapter, whether we turn to the Socialist Utopias of past ages, to the experiences of communistic societies, or to the doctrines preached by the leaders of Socialism, there is direct evidence on all sides to show that Socialism in its full development would involve the abolition of marriage as an institution, and would deprive it of all that at present distinguishes it from mere cohabitation.

The foregoing conclusions are indignantly repudiated by some sections of the Socialist Party.

For instance, Mrs. Ethel Snowden, the Socialist writer, in her recently published *The Woman Socialist*, in the chapter treating of the question of "Sex," at the outset makes the important admission that if Socialism stands for "Free Love," this "would, indeed, be ample justification for any and every attempt to

retard the progress of Society in the direction of Socialism, *if it were true*." [1]

We will make it clear in the course of the present chapter that "Free Love" has been actively championed by some of the leading Socialists in every part of the world; that fact, however, is by no means the foundation upon which we base our contention that "Free Love" is, and must be, an essential feature of a complete Socialist State. Such advocacy really amounts to nothing more than that there is an agreement between the Socialist leaders, who indulge in it, and ourselves on the point as to what full Socialism really involves.

The fact that some of the Socialist leaders favour "Free Love" to-day, does not justify the opponents of Socialism in denouncing all the adherents of Socialism as being in favour of "Free Love."

In many cases the humble supporters of the cause recoil from the idea of "Free Love." It should be proved to such persons, then, that the "Free Love" which they profess to loathe, is the inevitable concomitant of complete Socialism and an essential of it, and that they must choose either Socialism *and* Free Love, or Morality.

Surely they cannot expect to get a pure political and economic faith from tainted sources. The ordinary rank and file are ready enough to accept their Socialism from advocates of "Free Love." In a little while, who knows, they will be quite as willing to take "Free Love" from the advocates of Socialism—for the reason that "Free Love" is merely the Socialist order of morality.

[1] P. 51.

We have the admission of the leading English Socialist historian of Socialism in no less a work than the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, that "In the Marx school there is a tendency to denounce the legally binding contract in marriage."[1] A school which in Socialism is by far the most important in this as in other countries.

The connection, however, bases itself upon this, as Lamartine wrote in his celebrated History of the French Revolution of 1848: "Communism of goods leads, as a necessary consequence, to communism of wives, children, and parents, and to the brutalisation of the species."

Other historians have arrived at a like conclusion. Not only this, but Socialist leaders have themselves admitted all that Lamartine here asserts, save only his last conclusion.

Jäger in his *Socialismus* observes that the possession of land and soil in common, if it arises out of Materialism, leads also to community of wives as being another expression of materialistic communism.

Jäger also directs attention to the fact that "Jörissen expressed more openly the removal of all barriers in saying that a maiden who disposed freely of her love was no prostitute—she was *the free wife of the future*. . . . Between the married wife and the so-called prostitute there was only a quantitative difference. The children would necessarily belong to the State, and the State provide for both."[2]

In his essay treating of "Socialism and Sex,"

[1] Mr. Thomas Kirkup, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. xxii. p. 219.

[2] Quoted in Prof. Woolsey's *Communism and Socialism*, pp. 257, 258.

Professor Karl Pearson, one of the most distinguished of Socialist writers in this country, states : " With the centuries as the last traces of the patriarchate vanish, as woman obtains rights as an individual, when a new form of possession is coming into existence, is it rational to suppose that history will break its hitherto invariable law, and that a new sex-relationship will not replace the old ? "[1]

In a later passage Professor Pearson throws further light upon the nature of this " new sex-relationship."

Woman, so Professor Pearson in his essay informs us, will be the " physical and mental equal " of man " in any sex-partnership they may agree to enter upon. For such woman I hold that the sex-relationship, both as to form and substance, ought to be a pure question of taste, a simple matter of agreement between the man and her, in which neither Society nor the State would have any need or right to interfere."[2]

This latter conclusion Professor Pearson proceeds to modify in the case where " the sex-relationship does result in children ; then," so Professor Pearson emphatically declares, " the State will have a right to interfere . . ."[3]; and, apparently, in the writer's opinion will be forced to interfere.[4]

If communism in women is not to be permitted under the Socialist State, the promise of equality which Socialism makes fails at the very outset. David who, according to the Scriptures, would appear to have possessed most of the good things which this world

[1] *The Ethic of Free-thought*, p. 431.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 440.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 442.
[4] See as to this the essay on " Socialism and Sex," *Ibid.*, pp. 427–446.

is capable of conferring, yet coveted the wife of one of his humblest subjects. All else meantime failed to bring him satisfaction. Similarly, under Socialism, equal possessions would most certainly *not* confer contentment on one who had long set his eyes upon a woman who had come to be the wife of another.

"A really consistent communistic system, therefore," as Dr. Schäffle has emphasised, "would not admit free love according to individual choice, but rather love by turns, regulated on a basis of equality, the actual supply of women for all the men desiring them, and *vice versâ*, a universal sex communism, the Hetærism no longer of the horde, but of the organised Social State . . . ."[1]

Aught else, in fact, falls within the scope of "monopoly," as vehemently denounced by Socialists at the present time.

One of the greatest of French Socialist writers, M. Gabriel Deville, in advocating the suppression of marriage under Socialism and the substitution of "Free Love," thus summarises the principal reasons which account for the inherent antipathy to the continuance of marriage on the part of Socialism: "Marriage is a regulation of property, a business contract before being a union of persons, and its utility grows out of the economic structure of a society which is based upon individual appropriation. By giving guarantees to the legitimate children, and ensuring to them the paternal capital, it perpetuates the domination of the caste which monopolises the productive forces. . . . When property is transformed,

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, pp. 157, 158.

and only after that transformation, *marriage will lose its reason for existence*, and boys and girls may then freely, and without fear of censure, listen to the wants and promptings of their nature. . . . *There will be no room* for prostitution, or *for marriage*, which is in sum nothing more than prostitution before the mayor."[1]

Bebel, the great international Socialist leader, in his *Woman and Socialism* (translated into English under the title of *Woman: her Past, Present, and Future*), expresses much the same views as Deville in the following passage:—

"The *bourgeois* marriage is a consequence of *bourgeois* property. This marriage, standing as it does in the most intimate connection to property and the right of inheritance, demands 'legitimate' children as heirs. It is entered into for the purpose of obtaining them, and the pressure exercised by society has enabled the ruling classes to enforce it in the case of those who have nothing to bequeath. But as in the new community there will be nothing to bequeath . . . compulsory marriage becomes unnecessary from this standpoint *as well as from all others*."[2]

Nor in proof of the contention, that the State which enforces communism in respect of property will also support the same doctrines in regard to women, is it necessary, by any means, to rely solely on the foreign leaders of Socialism. Mr. Thornton Hunt, at one time "almost the official advocate of

[1] Quoted by Professor Lecky in his *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. pp. 348 and 349.

[2] Pages 231, 232. Quoted in Professor Lecky's *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 349.

communism," was led to admit that community of property, logically followed out, must in the end inevitably bring about the destruction of the institution of marriage.

"The existing monogamic relation," write two of the foremost leaders of English Socialism, Mr. Belfort Bax and Mr. H. Quelch, concerning marriage, "is simply the outcome of the institution of private or individual property. . . . When private property ceases to be the fulcrum around which the relations between the sexes turn, any attempt at coercion, moral or material, . . . must necessarily become repugnant to the moral sense of the community."[1]

Mr. Belfort Bax in his quite recent work, entitled *Socialism, What it is, and What it is not*, proceeds in the following passage to amplify the views of Socialism on this subject:—

"Then, again, as to the question of sexual ethics. To the anthropologist and the student of the history of institutions, it is well known that forms of marriage and the family are intimately connected with the prevailing modes of property-holding. Under primitive communistic conditions various forms of the family prevailed which appear grossly immoral to the man who has grown up among modern individualist conditions. Hence arises *the tendency in the present day of many convinced Socialists to shirk this question. They are, in their own minds*, perfectly well persuaded that in a society such as Socialism implies, based on the communal production of wealth for social use and enjoyment, and hence where private

[1] *A New Catechism of Socialism*, p. 35. (The Twentieth Century Press.)

property-holding has either ceased to be altogether, or at least has lost its importance—while they are, I say, *quite aware that in such a society the principle of rigid monogamy enforced by law and public opinion, as at present, must break down* before a freer conception of human relationships, yet they are extremely chary of admitting this in so many words. The current point of view of marriage as a legally enforced bond, and not a free-relationship depending for its continuance on the will of the parties concerned, has acquired an absolute character with many persons who otherwise consider themselves emancipated, and *hence there is a tendency either to deny the obvious implications of Socialism in this respect, or at least to fence with the question in a disingenuous manner.*" [1]

Professor Lecky thus comments on such statements as the foregoing: "It is perfectly true that marriage and the family form the tap-root out of which the whole system of hereditary property grows, and that it would be utterly impossible permanently to extirpate heredity unless family stability and family affection were annihilated. It is not less true that a system which preaches the most wholesale and undisguised robbery will never approve itself to the masses of men *unless* all the foundations and sanctions of morality have been effectually destroyed." [2]

Mr. F. Maddison, M.P., has recently contributed an able article on this subject in *London Opinion*,[3] entitled "Socialism and the Marriage Tie." In the course of his inquiry, Mr. Maddison effectually

[1] *Socialism, What It is, and What It is not*, published 1907, p. 10.
[2] *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 350.
[3] October 26, 1907.

disposes of the ordinary form of disclaimer to which English Socialists, for tactical purposes, frequently have recourse when confronted with the charge that Socialism seeks to destroy marriage, and to substitute in its place "Free Love."

From this article we quote the following: "We are always assured that Socialism is the only true internationalism. Without accepting that statement, it is true that the same body of economic, political, and philosophical doctrines are in the main accepted by Socialists throughout the world. It is, therefore, quite as competent to cite the authority of a representative German as of an English writer on Socialism. Thus we bring Herr Bebel as a witness against Mr. Grayson:—

> "'The gratification of the sexual impulse is as strictly the personal affair of the individual as the gratification of any other natural instinct. . . . No third person has the slightest right of intervention.'

"What is that but Free Love? In my estimation it is the philosophy of the poultry-yard. *Woman under it, despite all the jargon about economic independence, would be a heavy sufferer.* When these opinions are cited, Socialist apologists usually meet them by saying that they are but the private views of these particular leaders, and no more commit Socialists to them than do the agnostic opinions of members of the Liberal or Tory Parties. But *that argument breaks down before the fact that these representative Socialist leaders advance them as an integral part of Socialist doctrine.* Marriage and the family as we know it is declared to be an instrument of the capitalist class. As Bebel puts it:—

"'Marriage, as at present understood, is an arrangement most closely associated with the existing social status, and stands or falls with it.'

"In face of such a declaration by a man who is an 'acknowledged leader' of international Socialism, it is idle to contend that it does not represent the volume of Socialist opinion."

This portion of the Socialist policy has thus been criticised by one of the great French writers on Socialism.

"Dissolute brutes, under an iron yoke, is the ideal communism which Materialism dreams of," wrote M. Émile de Laveleye. "Herein is summarised the entire doctrine. Man is desirous of family joys, and of the supreme charm of liberty. Instead of these he is allotted compulsory labour and promiscuity of intercourse."[1]

If we pass next to the founders of Socialistic States, whether existing in reality or merely in the realms of fancy, the same insistence on the communism of woman is to be met with on their part.

". . . Both Lycurgus and Plato," as states Professor Lecky, "were prepared, in the interests of the State, to deal as freely with the relations of the sexes to each other, and with the relations of children to their parents, as with the disposition of property."[2]

The wife in the Socialistic State of Sparta, so we learn from Plutarch's *Life of Lycurgus*, was little more than common property.

". . . If a man of character should entertain a passion for a married woman, on account of her

[1] Quoted in Mr. M. D. O'Brien's *Socialism Tested by Facts*, p. 125.
[2] *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 229.

modesty and the beauty of her children, he might treat with her husband for admission to her company."[1]

Adultery as an offence was, in fact, got rid of by refusing to recognise the existence of any moral code capable of thus being infringed.

In the Socialistic Utopia described by Plato, "nothing existed that is separate and not common; where wives were common, and children, and everything that could be used."[2]

Similarly in the famous *City of the Sun*, first published by Thomas Campanella in 1623, one of the main points of his system consisted in a community of property and of wives.

Godwin in his *Political Justice* (first published in England in 1793), declared that "the institution of marriage is a system of fraud." Further, asserted the same author, "so long as I seek to engross one woman to myself, and to prohibit my neighbour from proving his superior desert and reaping the fruits, I am *guilty of the most odious of all monopolies*."[3]

In the last quoted words from the writings of Godwin there can be found one, at all events, of the *principal* reasons which account for the hostility of Socialism towards monogamy partaking of a permanent nature.

Private property in land and chattels is denounced by Socialists under the head of "Monopoly." Yet even more "odious," apparently, was reckoned by

[1] *Plutarch's Lives*, vol. i. p. 141.
[2] Quoted in Professor Woolsey's *Communism and Socialism*, p. 87.
[3] Book VIII. Quoted in Professor Lecky's *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 250.

Godwin the "monopoly" attaching to a woman who is faithful to her marriage vows.

An instructive modern picture of "Free Love" under Socialism is contained in the late Mr. William Morris's *News from Nowhere*. This work represents the Socialist State in being as pictured by one whom Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P., the chief founder of the I.L.P., has quite recently designated "the greatest man whom the Socialist movement has yet claimed in this country."[1]

In chapter ix., entitled "Concerning Love," a state of affairs is depicted by Mr. William Morris in which the parties temporarily live together, then separate and cohabit with other parties, and subsequently return to each other. The Divorce Court is described as having long ceased to be a legal necessity. "Fancy a Court for enforcing a contract of passion or sentiment!"[2]

The doctrine of the Socialist State is that "a child born from the natural and healthy love between a man and a woman, even if that be transient, is likely to turn out better in all ways, and especially in bodily beauty, than the birth of the respectable commercial marriage bed. . . ."[3]

Marital fidelity is, in fact, derided, and "Free Love" depicted not as the exception, but as the rule, in the Socialist State, and one which deserves encouragement rather than condemnation.

Mr. Noyes, in his *History of American Socialisms*, describes how the Perfectionists hold that "there is

[1] *From Serfdom to Socialism*, p. 25.
[2] P. 62, *News from Nowhere*.
[3] P. 69.

no intrinsic difference between property in persons and property in things; and that the same spirit which abolished exclusiveness in regard to money *would abolish*, if circumstances allowed full scope to it, *exclusiveness in regard to women and children.*" [1]

Mr. Hepworth Dixon, who has devoted special study to the actual working of communistic societies, observes that, "The fact remained, and in time it became known, that Fourier's system could not be reconciled any more than Owen's system could be reconciled, with the partition of mankind into those special groups called families, in which people live together a life devised by nature, under the close relation of husband and wife, of parent and child." [2]

". . . The very first conception of a Socialistic State is such a relation of the sexes," again writes Mr. Hepworth Dixon, "as shall prevent men and women from falling into selfish family groups. Family life is eternally at war with social life. When you have a private household you must have personal property to feed it; hence a community of goods—the first idea of a Social State—has been found in every case to imply a community of children and to promote a community of wives. *That you cannot have Socialism without introducing Communism is the teaching of all experience, whether the trials have been made on a large scale or on a small scale, in the old world or in the new.*" [3]

In addition, Socialism has provided us with the "*Réhabilitation de la Chair*" (Rehabilitation of the

[1] P. 625.
[2] *Spiritual Wives*, vol. ii. p. 220.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 209.

Flesh), as the doctrine presented during the nineteenth century by Enfantin and other St. Simonists was termed. This doctrine, in point of sensuality, profligacy, and bestiality, equalled, if it did not exceed, any which the worst periods of history are able to recall.

To revert again to the writings of the more modern Socialists bearing on this subject.

The late Mr. William Morris, in company with Mr. Belfort Bax, has written in denunciation of the present "sham" morality, the aim of which "is the perpetuation of individual property in wealth, in workman, in wife, in child."[1]

Later the same authors tell us on "the advent of social economic freedom" that "property in children would cease to exist." "Thus," they state, "a new development of the family would take place, on the basis, not of a predetermined lifelong business arrangement, to be formally and nominally held to, irrespective of circumstances, but on mutual inclination and affection, *an association terminable at the will of either party*. . . . There would be no vestige of reprobation weighing on the dissolution of one tie and the forming of another."[2]

"And now comes the question," write Dr. and Mrs. Aveling, two well-known Socialist writers, "as to how the future position of woman, and therefore of the race, will be affected by all this. . . . Whether monogamy or polygamy will obtain in the Socialistic State is a detail on which one can only speak as an individual. The question is too large to be solved

[1] *Socialism: Its Growth and Outcome*, p. 10.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 299, 300.

within the mists and miasmata of the capitalistic system. . . . The contract between man and woman will be of a purely private nature, without the intervention of any public functionary. The woman will no longer be the man's slave, but his equal. For divorce there will be no need." [1]

In one of the latest Socialist works treating of Woman under Socialism, it is interesting to note that the writer, while ostensibly setting out to refute the probable existence of "Free Love" under Socialism, herself portrays a condition in which marriage will cease to have any real binding validity.

Mrs. Snowden, in her recently published book, *The Woman Socialist*, informs her readers: "Free as the wind, the Socialist wife will be bound only by her natural love for husband and children;" [2] and that divorce "will be made more easy of accomplishment." [3] Also that incompatibility of temperament will be a ground for "complete dissolution of the contract, with leave to enter into another marriage." [4]

How do the following statements of Mrs. Snowden conform to the claim which this writer puts forward that Socialism and religion are not antagonistic?

"It is more than probable that the ordinary Church marriage service will be abolished. But it ought to be abolished. . . . Under Socialism the marriage service will probably be a simple declaration on the part of the contracting parties before the civil representatives of the State." [5]

[1] *The Woman Question*, by Edward and Eleanor Marx Aveling, pp. 15, 16.
[2] *The Woman Socialist*, p. 61.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 62.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 62.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 60–61.

If the religious marriage ceremony is to be prohibited under Socialism, as Mrs. Snowden here advocates, in the minds of countless members of different religions the Socialist State will be substituting for marriage a mere licensed cohabitation.

In view of the extreme similarity of principles which exist between Anarchism and Socialism (as to this see the chapter on Revolutionary Socialism, pp. 113–116), it becomes material in this connection to note that Anarchists have frequently advocated a return to aboriginal promiscuity.

Restraints in regard to sexual impulses draw down on the part of the Anarchists opposition as vehement as that which they display to all forms of legal restraint. Marriage, according to them, whether regarded as a political, religious, juridical, or civil institution, is to be abolished.

The foregoing evidence should go far towards convincing the most sceptical that Socialism would destroy marriage as an institution, and substitute in its place, ultimately at any rate, a reign of unbounded and unrestricted sensuality.

The attitude of Socialism towards marriage and the family is one of supreme importance, whether considered from the moral, political, or economic standpoint.

If the facts be properly placed before the women of the United Kingdom, we share Dr. Schäffle's belief that "not 5 per cent. of the proletariat women would vote for the loosening of family and marriage ties. . . ."[1]

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 340.

That women would almost unanimously reject with indignation proposals such as these, as tending *not* to the advancement of true happiness and progress, but as a return to vice and barbarism, we feel sure admits of no doubt.

Even were Socialism able to abundantly fulfil its promises to women of economic independence and equality, few women would be prepared to purchase these at the price which Socialism in its logical development would demand and unquestionably seek to exact.

Professor Flint in the following sentences has summed up what are the true characteristics of "Free Love." "So-called Free Love is untrue and degrading love; love from which all the pure, permanent, and elevating elements are absent; love reduced to animal passion and imaginative illusions; the love which is powerful to destroy families but powerless to sustain and organise them."[1]

In view of the foregoing it is of importance to note the following affirmation of "Free Love" recently made on behalf of Socialism by one of its most prominent supporters in this country.

Speaking in Kentish Town on November 12, 1907, Mr. H. Quelch of the Social Democratic Federation is reported to have said: "I am in favour of Free Love. What love are we in favour of if we are not in favour of Free Love? *I do want to abolish Marriage.* I do want to see the whole system of society as at present constituted swept away. I want to make it no more possible for a woman to sell herself in the marriage market than

[1] *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, p. 287.

for a man to sell himself in the labour market. *We want no marriage bond; we want no bonds at all. We do want Free Love.* We want no sexual bonds except those based on no other foundation than mutual affection."[1]

To much the same effect writes Professor Karl Pearson.

"Such then seems to me the Socialistic solution of the sex problem: *complete freedom in the sex-relationship* left to the judgment and taste of an economically equal, physically trained, and intellectually developed race of men and women; State interference, if necessary, in the matter of child-bearing, in order to preserve inter-sexual independence on the one hand, and the limit of efficient population on the other."[2]

"The Socialistic movement with its new morality and the movement for sex-equality," writes Professor Pearson in an earlier passage, "*must surely and rapidly undermine our current marriage customs and marriage law.*"[3]

Now what is the Socialist reply to these admissions and conclusions?

At the Council meeting of the Independent Labour Party, held on the 4th and 5th of October 1907, the following resolutions were adopted:—

"The National Council of the Independent Labour Party repudiates the attack upon Socialism on the ground that Socialism is opposed to religion, and declares that the Socialist movement embraces men and women of all religions and forms of belief, and

[1] *Birmingham Evening Dispatch*, November 13, 1907.
[2] *The Ethic of Free-thought*, p. 445. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 437.

offers the most complete freedom in this respect within its ranks.

"It further repudiates the charge that Socialism is antagonistic to the family organisation, and reminds the public that the disintegration of the family which has been in progress for some generations has been owing to the creation of slums, the employment of children in factories, the dragging of mothers into workshops and factories, owing to the economic pressure created by low wages, sweating and other operations of capitalism which the anti-Socialist campaign is designed to support, and which it is the purpose of Socialism to supplant."[1]

It should be remembered that these resolutions were hurriedly passed at a time when the Press was calling attention to the "Free Love" and atheistical attitude of many Socialist leaders. As a pious expression of opinion they are of interest, but they certainly are not reassuring. Even had they been accompanied by a stern repudiation of the Socialist writers who have advocated "Free Love"—and they were not—they would still have remained unconvincing.

The point which we, of course, desire to make is that it is not for Socialists to deduce the consequences which must flow from the adoption of Socialism. Once they are aware of the attributes of Socialism, opponents of Socialism are fully able to make their own independent deductions.

In this case we have not only a body of recognised Socialist opinion in this country which accepts "Free Love" as a sequel and part of Socialism, but, more

[1] *The Labour Leader*, October 18, 1907.

than that, we have observed that similar views are even more current on the Continent.

This is a grave matter, for is it not from Continental Socialists that our native-born Socialists have accepted most of their doctrines? To-day, it is true, many of them may become indignant at the bare association with the "Free Love" propaganda, yet it is impossible to touch pitch without being defiled. Familiarity steals the edge from disgust, and the man who begins by taking his poison in small doses is able before long to assimilate more and more of the noxious compound.

Who can say that in another few years these Independent Labour Party officials will not blush for the incomprehensible scruples which in the year 1907 prompted them to rush through a resolution in support of such a senseless thing—for as such they may yet live to describe it—as "conventional morality"?

The resolution of disclaimer which we have quoted expresses, it should be noted, the official view of the Independent Labour Party *only*. No similar disclaimer has been made by the Social Democratic Party, for instance—the party in which Mr. Belfort Bax and Mr. H. Quelch are persons of distinction.

Assuming that the resolution in question in fact represents the attitude of the members of the Independent Labour Party, that body, it should be recognised, is to no small extent composed of Socialists who are in the early stages of conversion. Later, when the doctrines of the new faith have been assimilated, a considerable section of those who began as Independent Labour Party men pass

on to the societies representing the more extreme views. Large numbers, for instance, drift into full and active membership of the revolutionary Social Democratic Party.

The Independent Labour Party consequently plays the part of the nursing mother of timid and faltering Socialists, and not only zealously withholds the strong meats of the full Socialist fare, but is also ever on the alert to steer clear of the strong situations which would be so trying to the courage of the newly initiated.

Indeed, the tactical history of the Independent Labour Party is one of guarded reserve, of compromise, and of "watering down." And in this work Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald, M.P., has proved himself to be skilful beyond the ordinary.

The Economic Position of Woman under Socialism

Next it becomes necessary to consider briefly what is to be the economic position of woman in the Socialist State.

Upon the political position of woman it is not thought relevant here to enter.

Necessarily if women, equally with men, are to be subjected to "the universal obligation to labour," the least the Socialist State in return can do is to undertake to provide for the woman upon the same, or upon much the same, terms as for the man.

During the past century female manual labour in the more civilised countries, such as England, has, so far as concerns the more severe kinds, tended *pro ratâ* to diminish.

For example, in England and Wales the total number of *females* engaged in agriculture in 1851 amounted to 436,174. In 1901 this number, despite the vast increase in population during these intervening fifty years, had decreased to 52,459.[1]

We have yet to learn that the general reintroduction of female manual labour, as contemplated under Socialism, represents in any sense an advance from the standpoint of civilisation. The same may be said also of the proposal to "relieve" the woman from the support of one of the stronger sex, whether it be father, husband, or brother.

Under Socialism, as Mr. O'Brien accurately points out, nobody is to support his own wife, but everybody is to support everybody else's wife.[2]

Socialism alone could be found to assert that such an alteration of the existing system represents in any sense an advance from, and not a return towards, barbarism. Further, is such a system either likely to promote contentment or to be accompanied by success?

In the Red Bank Community we learn, from Mr. Hepworth Dixon, how "single men complained that they had to work for children who were not their own. Smart young maids perceived that they had to bear the burdens without sharing in the pleasures of married women. Folks with small families objected to folks with large ones."[3]

Notwithstanding the above clear evidence as to the destructive attitude of Socialism in regard to

[1] See Cd. 1761 of 1903, p. 363.
[2] *Socialism Tested by Facts*, p. 122.
[3] *Spiritual Wives*, vol. ii. p. 224.

marriage, Socialists none the less venture to put forward such assertions as the following: "Socialism, again, would largely solve the woman question by making woman financially independent of man, without ignoring the natural differences that must ever exist between man and woman. It would rediscover married love in many a home by taking the money question out of marriage."[1]

Heavy, indeed, is the price which Socialism would claim from woman in return for an emancipation which in reality amounts only to an "emancipation of the man from the woman . . ."[2]

From Mr. Bernard Shaw's writings we learn that "The sum of the matter is that unless Woman repudiates her womanliness, her duty to her husband, to her children, to society, to the law, and to every one but herself, she cannot emancipate herself."[3]

Mr. Maddison, M.P., in the recent article to which reference has been made, sets forth one of the principal terms which this change in the status of woman under Socialism would exact from her.

"Socialist philosophy . . . offers women economic freedom and independence *as a substitute for the marriage bond.* The bargain is a bad one for her, for her dependence in some form or degree is decreed by nature. There cannot be such a thing as sex equality in the practical affairs of life. Marriage is primarily for the protection of women and children,

[1] *Handbook of Socialism*, by W. D. P. Bliss, p. 199.
[2] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, by Dr. Schäffle, translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 133.
[3] *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, p. 43.

and in spite of its abuses and shortcomings, it remains one of the bulwarks of human society."[1]

The Claim of Socialism to Abolish Prostitution

In considering the Woman question under Socialism, it is necessary to advert for a moment to the claim so constantly put forward by Socialists, that prostitution would utterly cease under the Socialist *régime*.

Were Socialism in reality able to effect such a change, provided that it be not accompanied by even greater social evils, the result would unquestionably represent a material advance in moral progress.

Mrs. Philip Snowden in her recent work *The Woman Socialist* asserts: "Socialists expect that under Socialism the terrible evil of prostitution will disappear."[2]

No tittle of evidence is ever put forward in support of this contention. As Dr. Schäffle has written: "Neither would 'Free Love' be even sure to exterminate prostitution, although this has been claimed for it. Those individuals who were least in request, and even others, more favoured, would be tempted" to sell themselves; "... even free marriage without any question of payment might, to a great extent, and probably would, cause the level of sexual intercourse to fall to the coarse sensuality of prostitution. It is therefore *not* possible to link the question of

[1] *London Opinion*, October 26, 1907.
[2] P. 56.

prostitution to the abolition of the stable marriage tie." [1]

It is interesting, however, to note that Mrs. Snowden herself immediately proceeds to profoundly modify this claim. "But if, as at present, the 'unfortunate woman' be regarded as a necessity in those days of advanced thought and increased opportunities, then her status must be raised." In short, the prostitute will not necessarily come to an end, but merely be accorded a higher social status. "She will be held to be performing a necessary social service." [2]

If this be all that the new *régime* is to effect, Socialism can claim most certainly no credit in regard to this matter.

The Cant Allegations of Socialism

Before quitting this subject of Woman under Socialism, the cant allegations and so-called arguments to which Socialists habitually to-day in this connection have recourse, require brief consideration.

The worst instances of present-day immorality, on which Socialists so frequently dilate, in no way constitute an argument in favour of the adoption of Socialism.

Immorality to-day can no more be directly imputed, as Dr. Schäffle rightly observes, to the existing industrial system, than can pure morality to the Socialist State. In both alike "morality or

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 150.

[2] *The Woman Socialist*, p. 56.

immorality does not arise merely out of the productive system, Social or Capitalistic."[1]

Professor Flint has shown how profoundly insincere are the criticisms of present-day morality in which Socialist writers and speakers for the most part delight to indulge, having regard to the fact that *their method for improving morality is to abolish all occasion for its exercise.*

"Socialist critics of what they call 'the *bourgeois* family,' or 'mercantile marriage,' can easily point out various imperfections prevalent in modern domestic life; but when, granting their criticisms not to be without more or less foundation, we ask them how they propose to get rid of, or at least to lessen, the evils which they have indicated, *they have virtually no other answer to give us than that they would introduce evils far worse*—absorption of the family in the community, free love, the separation of spouses at will, transference of children from the charge of their parents to that of the State."[2]

"If the Co-operative Commonwealth," writes the Socialist author, Mr. Laurence Gronlund, in reference to the Socialist State, "will not effect a vast improvement in the lot of woman, it is *not* worth striving for."[3]

In truth, unless the unrestricted reign of brutish lust and the destruction of all the higher and ennobling forms of family affection be accounted as "a vast improvement in the lot of woman," it is difficult to see how Socialism can fail to profoundly alter for the worse

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 165.
[2] *Socialism*, by Professor Flint, p. 283.
[3] *The Co-operative Commonwealth*, p. 145.

the destiny of the weaker sex. Its promises to do otherwise rank foremost among the many deceptions by means of which Socialists to-day hope to achieve their ends.

Bitter, indeed, would be the awakening of woman under the Socialist *régime*, when compelled to pay the price attaching under Socialism to the grant of "economic liberty."

XII

SOCIALISM AND THE FAMILY

CLOSELY akin to the subject of Woman under Socialism is that of Socialism in its bearing in regard to the Family. This latter subject takes equal rank in point of importance with the former.

That Socialism is to be accompanied by sweeping and drastic changes as regards the existence of the home, the rights and duties of parents, and the upbringing of children, in view of Socialist writings and utterances, can admit of no doubt.

Mr. H. M. Hyndman predicts under Socialism "the complete change in all family relations," which must issue in "a widely extended communism."[1]

Anything approaching to family life draws down the fiercest denunciations on the part of some of the Socialists. For example, Mr. Belfort Bax writes: "We defy any human being to point to a single reality, good or bad, in the composition of the *bourgeois* family. It has the merit of being the most perfect specimen of the complete sham that history has presented to the world."[2]

"Let us take another 'fraud' of middle-class

[1] *The Historical Basis of Socialism*, p. 452.
[2] *The Religion of Socialism*, p. 141.

family life,'" continues Mr. Bax, "the 'family party.'"[1]

All that partakes of family life is under Socialism to be summarily consigned to complete and immediate destruction.

"The transformation of the current family-form . . . must inevitably follow the economic revolution. . . . The *bourgeois* 'hearth' . . . will then be as dead as Roman Britain."[2]

Reasons accounting for the Socialist's Hatred of Family Institutions

There can be little doubt that one of the principal reasons which serves to account for the Socialist hatred of family institutions is that, in their minds, family life partakes essentially of "monopoly." What right, argues the Socialist, has any small group of persons to seek their life and happiness *apart from* the rest of the community? What right has any man to usurp one woman? again asserts the Socialist. What right, further, have parents to regard their offspring as private property, or in any way as belonging to themselves and not to the State? Once again, what right has a family to home joys not shared in equally by the community at large?

One and all of these sentiments inherent to Socialism are begotten of malignant jealousy, and spring from that ultra-individualism which, as Dr. Schäffle has so frequently stated, is one of the fundamental characteristics of Socialism.

[1] *The Religion of Socialism*, p. 142.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 145.

Socialism and the Family

The Family under Socialism

The family, to quote the opinion of one of the great leaders of International Socialism—M. Jules Guesde—was useful and indispensable in the past, but is now *only an odious form of property. It must be either transformed or totally abolished.* M. Guesde conjectures that the time may come when *the family relationship will be reduced to the relation of the mother to her child "at the period of lactation,* and that, moreover, the sexual relations between man and woman, founded on passion or mutual inclination, should be enabled to become as free, as changeable, and as diverse as the intellectual or moral relations between individuals of the same or different sexes." [1]

Mr. H. G. Wells, the well-known English Socialist, in an article on Socialism published in *The Fortnightly Review* for November 1906, thus summarises the position of the family under Socialism: "My concern now is to point out that Socialism repudiates the private ownership of the head of the family as completely as it repudiates any other sort of private ownership. . . . Socialism, in fact, is the State family."

To much the same effect write Mr. William Morris and Mr. Belfort Bax. They inform us that under Socialism "property in children would cease to exist. . . ." "Thus," state these two writers, "a new development of the family would take place. . . ." [2]

[1] See *Le Cathéchisme Socialiste*, by M. Jules Guesde, pp. 72–79, quoted n Prof. Lecky's *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 350.
[2] *Socialism: Its Growth and Outcome*, p. 299.

Mr. O'Brien in the following passage directs attention to one of the fundamental differences which exists between Socialism and the present system: "According to Socialism, the family exists for the State. According to individualism, the State exists for the family."[1]

The consequences which flow from this essential difference between the two systems are many and far-reaching.

Under Socialism the individual is "to think, speak, train his children or even beget them, as the State directs or allows, in the interest of the common good."[2]

That these two latter restrictions are to be imposed on the individual under Socialism, vitally though they interfere with individual liberty, will be sufficiently evident from what follows.

In place of the present home life, which has hitherto been regarded as one of the institutions on which the British have most cause to pride themselves, there is to be substituted under Socialism a universal system of Foundlings' Hospitals for the children, and not improbably a sort of barrack accommodation for the parents.

Mr. Robert Blatchford, for example, in his celebrated *Merrie England*, provides us with kaleidoscopic views of Socialist life spent in public dining-rooms, in public this and public that. ". . . We set up one great kitchen, one general dining-hall, and one pleasant tea-garden."[3]

[1] *Socialism Tested by Facts*, p. 129.
[2] Mr. Rae's *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 16.
[3] *Merrie England*, p. 49. See also pp. 44, 48.

Such conditions Mr. Blatchford describes as "much more sociable and friendly."

Similarly Mrs. Annie Besant in *Industry under Socialism* furnishes us with a picture of "public meal-rooms," "large dwellings," which are to "replace old-fashioned cottages;"[1] in fact, to all the paraphernalia of the barracks, if not of the workhouse.

What is this but a sort of resurrected Socialist State of Peru, where "the people were required to dine and sup with open doors, that the judges might be able to enter freely."[2]

This, then, according to the accounts of many Socialists, is to be the life of the *adult* population in the Socialist State. So far as the *youth* of the community are concerned, their upbringing from almost their very entry into life is to take place in the glorified Foundlings' Hospitals which Socialism is to establish throughout the country.

"The Socialist mothers," states the Socialist writer, Mrs. Snowden, in regard to the upbringing of children, "will take charge of the very early years."[3]

Other Socialist writers, as, for example, M. Guesde, would reduce the custody by the mothers of their children to a still shorter period from the date of birth.

Plato, in depicting his Socialistic State, speaks of the State taking every precaution to prevent any woman from recognising her own child.

[1] *Fabian Essays*, p. 155.

[2] See Mr. Herbert Spencer's article in *The Contemporary Review* for September 1881, vol. xl. p. 345. See further as to this the chapter on the "Socialist State," p. 161.

[3] *The Woman Socialist*, p. 88.

From this, modern Socialist teaching appears to differ but little, if at all. Mr. William Morris and Mr. Belfort Bax, writing in conjunction, in *Socialism: Its Growth and Outcome*, assure us that under Socialism, "... property in children would cease to exist. ..."[1]

Socialism would, consequently, impose the support of the children upon the State in substitution for the liability of the parents. In so doing Socialism would, in fact, replace the existing obligation by a system infinitely less just than that which to-day prevails. No one, in a word, is to be called upon to maintain his own children, while from every one there is to be exacted the support of the children of the *other* members of the community.

One of the fundamental changes in connection with this branch of the present subject which Socialism would effect concerns the education of children.

In lieu of supplementing family education by State education, Socialism would bring about an entire substitution of the former by the latter. The Socialist *régime* "would not simply supplement family upbringing; it would of necessity weaken and ultimately supersede it."[2] This would result, to quote again the words of Dr. Schäffle, in robbing "the overwhelming majority of the people, whose well-being it is designed to secure, of the highest and purest form of happiness, and of that very form which differences of outward circumstances down

[1] P. 299.

[2] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, by Dr. Schäffle, translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 153.

to the very lowest conditions almost entirely fail to touch. . . ." [1]

Further, "it would tend either to make parents indifferent to the lot of their children, which would be prejudicial both to the child's happiness and to its good upbringing, or to set the parents constantly in arms against the organs of public education. . . ." In addition, "it would destroy the love of parents for their children, and of children to their parents, and by sapping all the springs of individuality would prevent all possibility of an individualising system of education on the part of the State." [2]

Such a system would, in short, profoundly alter for the worse the characters of both children and parents alike.

Professor Woolsey in his valuable history treating of Communism, specially calls attention to the fact that the history of the communistic societies goes to show that "family affections—one essential means by which man rises above the brute, and religion with all human improvements finds a home in the world—are *nearly undeveloped.*" [3]

The Population Question

One of the many important questions which Socialists for the most part endeavour to hastily brush aside is that regarding Population.

Mr. Thomas Kirkup, for example, thus airily dismisses a subject which must bear critically on the

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bosanquet, p. 153.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 153–155.
[3] *Communism and Socialism*, p. 71.

welfare of the Socialist State: "As Socialism generally means the supremacy of reason and morals over the natural forces, so with reference to the population question it means that natural appetite should be controlled by nobler and more rational feelings and principles." [1]

The subject has received more careful consideration from one of the most erudite of English Socialists, who arrives at the inevitable conclusion that State restrictions on population will be necessitated by Socialism.

". . . I think the sex relationship of the future will not be regarded as a union for the birth of children," writes Professor Karl Pearson, a leading English Socialist, "but as the closest form of friendship between man and woman. It will be accompanied by no child-bearing or rearing, or by these in a much more limited measure than at present. . . . With the sex relationship, so long as it does not result in children, we hold that the State of the future will in nowise interfere; but when it does result in children, then the State will have a right to interfere, and this on two grounds: first, because the question of population bears on the happiness of society as a whole; and secondly, because child-bearing enforces for a longer or shorter interval economic dependence upon the woman." [2]

In an earlier passage the same writer informs us: ". . . I believe that the existence of such a field essentially demands a limitation of population. Now it will profit little that the social man and woman

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 302.
[2] *The Ethic of Free-thought*: "Socialism and Sex," p. 440.

without constraint limit the number of their offspring, if large anti-social sections of society continue to bring any number of unneeded human beings into the world."[1]

Mr. Stanley Robertson thus tersely sums up the position in a sentence: "Socialism without restraints on the increase of population would be utterly inefficient. With such restraints it would be slavery."[2]

This question is undoubtedly one of grave social importance, and cannot in practice be disregarded in the brusque manner in which many Socialists would wish it to be.

Mrs. Fawcett in her *Handbook on Economics* arrives at a similar conclusion. In her opinion Socialism necessitates celibacy, and consequently intolerable Government control.

This question has received critical attention from the late John Stuart Mill, who in his *Principles of Political Economy* states: "Every one has a right to live. We will suppose this granted. But no one has a right to bring creatures into life to be supported by other people. Whoever means to stand upon the first of these rights must renounce all pretensions to the last. If a man cannot support even himself unless others help him, those others are entitled to say that they do not also undertake the support of any offspring which it is physically possible for him to summon into the world. . . . It would be possible for the State to guarantee employment at ample wages to all who are born. But if it does this it is

[1] *The Ethic of Free-thought*: "Socialism and Sex," pp. 438–440.
[2] "The Impracticability of Socialism," published in *A Plea for Liberty*, p. 56.

bound in self-protection, and for the sake of every purpose for which Government exists, to provide that no person shall be born without its consent."[1]

This and other statements of John Stuart Mill bearing on this question, Professor Karl Pearson quotes *in extenso* and apparently with approval.[2]

That the Socialist State must inevitably be compelled to enforce State restrictions on families follows from the fact that, were all wealth to be brought into a common fund as the Collectivist *régime* entails, there would forthwith disappear the apparent need for all self-imposed restrictions on population.

This would result owing to the removal from the parents' shoulders of the personal liability to support their own offspring.

Socialism, consequently, would be forced *either* to substitute a State sanction in place of the personal sanction, which would be destroyed by its action, *or* to permit all its endeavours to increase the standard of comfort in the community to be counteracted and nullified by an excessive increase in population.

For Socialism to passively acquiesce in and adopt the latter alternative would be equivalent to acquiescing in its own downfall. It is obvious, therefore, that Socialism would of necessity be forced to place State restrictions upon families.

As John Stuart Mill has again stated: "If the ordinary and spontaneous motives to self-restraint are removed, others must be substituted."[3]

Mr. Stanley Robertson in the following passage

[1] *The Principles of Political Economy*, People's edition, p. 220, and see pp. 226 and 227.

[2] See *Ethic of Free-thought*, note to p. 439.

[3] *The Principles of Political Economy*, People's edition, p. 220.

proceeds to consider the further consequences which would probably accrue from such action on the part of the State:—

"Restraints on marriage always result in an increase of illicit unions and of illegitimate births. Are we prepared to make cohabitation out of wedlock a crime? The mediæval church tried to do that, and conspicuously failed. Indeed, it is wonderful in how many instances modern Socialism is compelled, as it were, to hark back to the methods of mediæval despotism. . . ."[1]

Sparta, under the rule of Lycurgus, afforded one of the earliest examples of a Socialist State. On this account its methods are not without their lessons in this connection to-day.

From Plutarch's *Life of Lycurgus* we learn that " . . . Lycurgus considered children not so much the property of their parents as of the State. . . . It was not left to the father to rear what children he pleased, but he was obliged to carry the child to a place called Lesche to be examined by the most ancient men of the tribe. . . . If it was weakly and deformed, they ordered it to be thrown into the place called Apothetæ, which is a deep cavern. . . ."[2]

Whilst Sparta solved its population problem by such methods as these, Babœuf, the great French Socialist, who played an important part in the celebrated French Revolution of 1789, equally realised the essential need for grappling with this problem. The means advocated by Babœuf were no less drastic than those which formerly prevailed in Sparta.

[1] "The Impracticability of Socialism," published in *A Plea for Liberty*, p. 56.

[2] *Plutarch's Lives*, vol. i. pp. 141, 142.

The proposals propounded by Babœuf were, in short, that the guillotine should be periodically called into requisition in order to remove any excess in numbers. This "remedy," with delightful impartiality, was to be applied to young and old alike. Such, in brief, were the proposals of one of the great forerunners of modern Socialism.

Before dismissing finally these important subjects of Woman and the Family under Socialism, attention should be called to the following words to which one of the more thoughtful of modern English Socialists has recently given expression.

"Finally, Socialistic speculation has in many cases tended," writes Mr. Kirkup, "not to reform and humanise, but to subvert the family, on the soundness of which social health, above all things, depends. It has not understood the solidity and value of the hereditary principle in the development of society. *Socialists have, in short, been far too ready to attack great institutions, which it must be the aim of all rational progress, not to subvert, but to reform and purify.*"[1]

In conclusion it may be said that the effect of Socialism, in regard to family institutions, would be scarcely less injurious than the changes which the new *régime* would introduce in regard to the position of women. In attempting in both these departments to remedy existing evils, Socialism would, if established, substitute other and far greater evils in place of those which it to-day so vehemently denounces.

[1] *History of Socialism*, pp, 276, 277. 1906 edition.

XIII

SOCIALISM AND THE DEFENSIVE FORCES

THE Socialists are in a dilemma in regard to the important problem of defence. If one tithe of their brotherly love prophecies be fulfilled under Socialism, army, navy, and even police will become superfluous. To provide, therefore, for the maintenance of either army or navy is, of itself, tantamount to casting an aspersion on the ethical creed which Socialists to-day so loudly profess.

THE TWO ALTERNATIVE POLICIES.

The result is that we have one body of Socialist opinion which protests that there will be no need for defensive forces at all, and another body holding the opposite view. As a concession to sentiment, however—and perhaps as a precautionary measure for the sympathetic support of the official faction in the Socialist State—the defensive forces are to be retained, but only on the basis of "national citizen forces."

The views of the idealists, who desire no such force at all, are represented by the following:—

The Case against Socialism

Of Socialism, Mr. John Spargo, the American Socialist author, writes: "Signifying as it does faith in the comradeship of man as the proper basis of social life, prefiguring *a social state in which there shall be no strife of man against man, or nation against nation*, it is a verbal expression of man's loftiest aspirations crystallised into a single word." [1]

"On the ethical side, Socialism," writes Mr. Sidney Webb, "expresses the real recognition of fraternity. . . ." [2]

A question put by a Socialist at a Unionist political meeting held in London in December 1907 took the following form. We quote it as an example of a type of question which we have frequently heard put, and of a line of thought constantly attempted to be argued by Socialist speakers.

"With regard to war under Socialism, is the speaker aware that Socialism is international in its aspirations, and that under its shadow the nations of the earth will be found to dwell *in one universal brotherhood?*"

The second of the two alternatives referred to above is thus dealt with in the programme of the Social Democratic Federation of Great Britain:—

"The abolition of standing armies, and the establishment of national citizen forces. The people to decide on peace and war." [3]

Such a programme is merely a repetition of a policy approved of by Socialists many years ago. For example, at the great Socialist Congress held at

[1] *Socialism*, published in 1906, p. 7.
[2] *Socialism in England*, 3rd edition, p. 10.
[3] See *The Social Democratic Federation: Its Objects, Its Principles, and Its Work*, by Mr. H. Quelch, p. 15.

Gotha in 1875, universal liability to military service, and the substitution of a national militia in place of a permanent army, formed part of the programme then resolved on.

The Socialists' Hatred towards the Defensive Forces

The Socialists' hatred towards the defensive forces, as at present constituted, emanates, no doubt, largely from the apprehension that these same forces may tend to hinder, if not to ultimately prevent, the successful accomplishment of their aims.

Evidence of this apprehension was forthcoming from every Socialist platform during the riots in Belfast, which took place during the summer of 1907. The rioters—so claimed the Socialists—were the majority of the people of Belfast. Therefore the military should have supported the rioters *instead of* supporting "the Capitalists."

The absurdity of this reasoning is demonstrated when it is realised that what was really at stake was the maintenance of law and order. Even if the upholders of the Constitution were temporarily in a minority in Belfast (which unquestionably was *not* the case), they were overwhelmingly in the majority throughout the United Kingdom considered as a whole. Socialists, therefore, were hopelessly in the wrong in claiming that because the military belonged to the State, and that because, according to their contention, in some arbitrarily picked, and relatively small, area the State was represented by a mob, *ergo* the military should do the bidding of that mob.

None the less the Belfast case is instructive. If the Socialists find themselves compelled to retain an armed force, they will only tolerate a force under such conditions as will enable them to control it for their own ends in "the class war" which they represent to be inevitable.

The celebrated Socialist, Karl Kautsky, in his work *The Social Revolution*, thus clearly defines the essential need, if Socialism is to be attained, for subverting the allegiance of the army to the existing *régime*: "Militarism can only be overcome through the military themselves proving untrustworthy, *not* through their being defeated by the revolted people."[1]

Socialist Incitement to Revolt

Incitement to disloyalty to-day forms a noteworthy characteristic of Socialism. It is in France, possibly, that the most active campaign has as yet been initiated with a view to subverting the allegiance and discipline of the defensive forces.

The Pall Mall Gazette of October 8, 1907, thus accurately describes the French Socialist of the present day: "*He does not hesitate to proclaim himself*, as M. Clemenceau remarked on Sunday, *a parricide who awaits the crisis of his country's fortunes in order to stab its defenders in the back and further the triumph of its enemies.* To this end a systematic effort is made to undermine the discipline and loyalty of those citizens to whom the Republic confides its safety. The conscript on his way to training is plied with *seditious leaflets, suggesting that he should shoot his own*

[1] Translated by J. B. Askew, p. 43.

officers on the field of battle; the dockyard and the arsenal worker are corrupted with the same treacherous injunctions; and it is no exaggeration to say that the whole defensive organisation of France is paralysed by the knowledge of this hideous canker and by uncertainty as to the vital points at which it may assert itself. . . ."

In this movement it is the names of M. Hervé and M. Jaurès, the two principal leaders of Socialism in France at the present time, that have chiefly acquired so unenviable a notoriety.

For example, in a speech delivered on September 7, 1907, M. Jaurès, the French Socialist leader, uttered an outrageous appeal to the French soldiers to use their rifles against the government that refused arbitration without inquiring on their part which side was the aggressor.[1]

Such a campaign is to-day, however, by no means confined to Socialism in France. In October 1907 Karl Liebknecht, a son of the great German Socialist leader, and himself a prominent advocate of Socialism in Germany, was tried and convicted of promoting anti-militarism. In a brochure published by him, Herr Liebknecht declared the crushing of militarism, which is an important weapon of the *bourgeoisie* against the proletariat, to be an imperative necessity for the success of the proletariat's fight for freedom.

Signs are not wanting that a similar campaign on the part of the Socialists is to be actively carried on in the United Kingdom. In fact, Socialism in this country has long been striving to undermine the fidelity of those serving in the defensive forces.

[1] See *The Times*, September 14, 1907.

Special circulars are now being distributed among the rank and file by the Social Democratic Federation, with the view to achieve this object.

Mr. Victor Grayson, M.P., one of the latest Socialist accessions to the British House of Commons, in a public speech at Wigan on September 23, 1907, thus delivered himself :—

"I am looking forward to the time when the British soldier will emulate his brother of the National Guard of France, and when asked to fire upon the people who are fighting for their rights *will turn his rifle in the other direction*. . . . We are making a Socialist now of Tommy Atkins by propaganda work in the army. It is very interesting work, and we are making Socialists there by the dozen." [1]

Will Socialism put an End to War?

The English Socialist historian, Mr. Thomas Kirkup, in his *History of Socialism*, declares :—

". . . Europe is like a vast camp in which science and finance are strained to the uttermost in order to devise and provide instruments for the destruction of our fellow-men." [2]

It is scarcely necessary to observe, however, that no country maintains instruments of destruction for destruction's own sake. Territory, commerce, trade, have *all* to be safeguarded. We believe that it will be clear that similar precautions would be equally necessary under Socialism. However effusive International Socialism may to-day profess to be, national

[1] *The Wigan Observer*, September 28, 1907.
[2] 1906 edition, p. 121.

instincts and divisions will outlive the centuries. Nor will national ambition and the desire for acquisition instantaneously perish at the bidding of some International Socialist Conference. Language, traditions, customs, and various other circumstances will all help to divide the peoples of the world for, at all events, countless generations to come. The proposed world-wide economic change, which Socialism propounds, will only strengthen these factors of division and dissension. At the present time the area of international dissension is limited in the main to the questions incidental to "spheres of influence" and the like. If, however, commercial exchange values in every branch of production are to become the subject of diplomacy, with the increase in the points of contact, not only will nationalism be fostered but the perils of international conflict will be increased.

A sentimental Internationalism, which in actual fact must, with the economic change attending it, develop into nothing less than a score of centres of Nationalism, bitter, defensive and aggressive, is no sort of a guarantee for the abolition of the world's Militarism. Indeed, as Mr. Thomas Kirkup himself admits in writing of Militarism :—

". . . Its causes are too deeply rooted in human nature and in the present stage of social development to be removed by anything less than a profound change in the motives and conditions of life."[1]

Socialists preach the righteousness and justice of confiscating land, railways, factories, mines, and all other valuable forms of property. Once

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 121.

accomplished (*unless* we suppose the highly improbable case of every civilised nation simultaneously sinking their nationality and henceforth becoming merely an *indivisible* part of one all-absorbing Socialist State), it will be necessary for the new form of government to guard not only the wealth which it thus annexes, but also the vast wealth which is to be produced (according to Socialist representations) under the Socialist *régime*.

For example, we are told that to quadruple the present national output from production would, under Socialism, be the simplest thing possible.

To protect, therefore, this vast and unparalleled wealth, an increased navy and army, with all that these necessarily entail to render them effective, in the form of equipment, &c., would at once have to be provided. Needless to say, we unhesitatingly doubt that wealth will become "as plentiful as water" under Socialism.

Socialists, however, are not entitled to argue that such results will accrue, and in the same breath to maintain that neither army nor navy will be required to guard these caves of Aladdin.

Socialism, if it ever does receive the support in any country of a majority, will owe its majority very largely to the sentiment that for the wealth of one individual to largely exceed that of other less fortunate individuals is an injustice, which should at once be repaired, and, if need be, by force. The same sentiment of envy, or call it what you will, would apply with equal force to the wealth possessed by some more fortunate community, as to that of individuals *quâ* individuals. Any existing disparity of

wealth will always be sufficient to fan such sentiments into flame. Only the possession of superior force will be able, therefore, for any length of time to secure a community in the continued enjoyment of greater material wealth than that which falls to the lot of neighbouring communities.

Seeing that some countries are so much more desirable than others in point of climate, mineral resources, and natural productiveness, life in those favoured lands would be easier and more attractive than it would be in other parts of the world. Having been assured that all the world was his own, and every man his brother, the Socialist would seek the land where toil was lightest. An inrush such as this point of view would tend to promote—if it were not promptly met—would demoralise organisation and render the Socialist form of government an utter impossibility.

Might not in time the same desire for acquisition, which would animate the individual, animate the whole of an excluded people? Why should the Socialists of the poorer lands, for instance, toil twice the number of hours which were necessary to the supply of the needs of the Socialists of the richer lands? Unless the Socialist inhabitants of the richer lands possessed an efficient force of some kind or other, what would there be to prevent a successful incursion?

It is believed, then, that a few moments' thought will suffice to convince most persons that human nature being what it is, militarism *must* continue, whatever the prevailing economic conditions may be. Possibly something might be achieved in the

direction of the curtailment of armaments, but the same object might be attained equally, if not more effectually, under non-Socialistic conditions.

In this connection it is well to recall the reply of George Washington, which was given to a senator of the United States who had proposed to limit the standing army of that country to 3000. To this proposal George Washington assented on condition that the hon. member would guarantee that the country should never be invaded by an army of more than 2000.[1]

The truth is that both army and navy, as at present constituted, are a serious obstacle in the way of the success of "the class war." Are they not officered in the main by that very class which Socialists denounce as the "idle rich"?

This is an ugly fact for Socialists. Their case is that the rich are effete and rotten. The answer that comes is that, wherever there is fighting to be waged and the hardships of a campaign to be endured, it is the "idle rich," who, taking their lives in their hands, fight side by side with the ranks, and appeal by their courage and endurance to the best instincts of the men whom they command. The Citizen Forces proposal, as propounded by the Socialists, is designedly framed with a view to undermining the national respect for the fighting qualities of the present officer class.

Equality versus Discipline

Further, the existence of any officer class is in direct antagonism to the Socialist idea of equality.

[1] Quoted in *A Plea for Liberty*, p. 98.

Socialism and the Defensive Forces

One of the principal reasons which partly accounts for the Socialists' hatred of the army and for their anti-military spirit, is that Socialists instinctively recognise that an army necessarily engenders an organisation based on the existence of differences in rank. As such it inevitably conflicts with Socialist theories as to "Equality." Hence national pride must be rooted out in order to pave the way for the suppression of the army.

The same sentiment exists undoubtedly on the part of Socialists towards the navy. Owing, however, to the circumstance that in most countries, especially in Continental countries, the army is of both greater importance and attracts more public notice than does the navy, it is in regard to the army that this sentiment has hitherto chiefly manifested itself amongst Socialists.

It is in vain that sociology teaches that the gift of rule is to a large extent hereditary. So much is this the case, indeed, that the few exceptions to the contrary are merely added evidence of this fact. The Socialist pretends at any rate to believe that every private is a potential commander-in-chief. And similarly with regard to the navy.

No definite information is forthcoming as to what is to be the form which the citizen forces are to assume under Socialism. A strict adherence to Socialist principles requires the abolition of all distinctions in rank. (See the chapter on "Equality and Liberty," p. 204 *et seq.*)

That such a principle is compatible with success in war, whether on land or sea, has yet to be demonstrated. Certainly all the teachings of history

are opposed to it. The doctrines of Socialism are, in fact, directed to show that no more credit is due to Napoleon for the victory of Austerlitz than to the youngest drummer-boy then serving in the French army.

Further, if Socialism finally decides to recognise the existence of different ranks in its citizen forces, it will still be prohibited from bestowing upon the higher ranks a higher reward.

No higher reward of a material nature could either under a system of equal distribution *or* of distribution "according to needs," be bestowed upon any of the officers, or even upon a successful general or admiral, without a departure from Socialist principles.

Socialism and the Navy

For various reasons it is evident that the interests of Socialism lie in the direction of reducing the number of residents in the Socialist State who are non-producers to the lowest possible minimum. Such is, in fact, an axiom of Socialism. This doubtless contributes to induce the Socialists to insist upon the scheme of a citizen army. The principle in view is that training and productive labour should accompany one another—that the workers should be soldiers and the soldiers workers. This, of course, might to a limited extent be feasible in the case of the army, but it would be impossible in the case of a navy.

So complex a piece of mechanism as the modern warship could never be efficiently manned *unless* the

crew had undergone a course of training and instruction extending over a considerable period. If the truth of this contention be admitted, it necessarily follows that those serving in the navy will have to be maintained out of the production of the rest of the community.

Further, it follows that the distinction between a civilian class and a class trained chiefly with a view to war will, under Socialism, have to be retained. In other words, such a force can no longer accurately be described as being a "citizen force."

How Socialism would Weaken the United Kingdom

To provide both the men and the munitions of war required by this country for its defence, reliance will, under Socialism, have to be placed *solely* on the population of the United Kingdom. As shown in the chapter on "International Socialism," Socialism is inherently antagonistic to the maintenance of an empire. This applies not only to the *form* of government, but also to the principle of federation, as, under Socialism, each country is to become, pending the abolition of all State divisions (so we are generally led to believe), entirely self-supporting and wholly independent of its neighbours. Each community is to exist, as it were, surrounded by a ring fence.

Consequently, the United Kingdom would, by the adoption of Socialism, *ipso facto* deprive itself of assistance from the various self-governing communities, India, the crown colonies, &c., which to-day go to form the British Empire.

The break-up of the Empire would, so far as the United Kingdom is concerned, entail a vast reduction in point of men and of resources, and no corresponding diminution of responsibilities. Without the other parts of the Empire, various authorities of note have expressed the opinion that the United Kingdom for its protection would still require an equally strong navy.

Further, for the protection of the United Kingdom, a navy would remain no less a paramount necessity under a Socialist *régime* than it is to-day.

The Need for Efficient Defence

We are aware, of course, of the stock Socialist retort to all appeals for support for the present army and navy. "Why should we fight or pay others to fight for the country?" they demand. "Whose country is it? Not yours, not mine, but the capitalists'." And just the same ignorant disclaimer is employed with regard to Empire and foreign policy. "Why look beyond England?" these people interrupt. "Set England right, and leave the rest of the world to look after itself."

Indeed, the failure to realise the vital importance of Empire and foreign policy is unfortunately not merely confined to Socialists.

Mr. Mallock concludes his work on *Labour and the Popular Welfare* with the following powerful appeal to the working classes: "Successful foreign policy means the maintenance or the achievement of those conditions that are most favourable to the industries of our own nation; and this means the conditions

that are most favourable to the homes of our own people.

"It is too commonly supposed that the greatness and the ascendency of our Empire minister to nothing but a certain natural pride ; and natural pride, in its turn, is supposed by some to be an immoral and inhuman sentiment peculiar to the upper classes. No one will be quicker to resent this last ludicrous supposition than the great masses of the British people ; but, all the same, they are apt to think the former supposition correct—to regard the mere glory of the country as the principal result of our Empire ; and such being the case, they are, on occasion, apt to be persuaded that glory can be bought at too dear a price, in money, struggle, or merely international friction. At all events they are constantly tempted to regard foreign politics as something entirely disconnected with their own immediate, their domestic, their personal, their daily interests. . . .

"To a very great extent on the political future of this country depends the magnitude of its income, and on the magnitude of its income depends the income of the working classes . . . and that when popular support is asked for some foreign war, the sole immediate aim of which seems the defence of some remote frontier or the maintenance of British prestige, it may well be that our soldiers will be really . . . fighting to keep away from British and Irish doors not the foreign plunderer and the ravisher, but *enemies still more pitiless—the want, the hunger and the cold that spare neither age nor sex*, and against which all prayers are unavailing."[1]

[1] *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, pp. 334–336.

The late Lord Beaconsfield was accustomed to emphasise much the same principles.

Speaking at Manchester on April 3, 1872, Lord Beaconsfield said: "... The relations of England to the rest of the world, which are 'foreign affairs,' are the matters which most influence his (an Englishman's) lot. Upon them depends the increase or reduction of taxation. Upon them depends the enjoyment or embarrassment of his industry. And yet, though so momentous are the consequences of the mismanagement of our foreign relations, no one thinks of them till the mischief occurs."

Yet to emphasise the importance of foreign affairs is but to emphasise the need for maintaining strong and efficient defensive forces, since in the absence of the latter it is possible for diplomacy to achieve but little. Again, what is an efficient scheme of defence if it be not national insurance?

Socialism and Disarmament

Unless diplomacy be backed by a strong force success would most certainly *not* attend the conduct of foreign negotiations.

What, then, is the probability of a Collectivist State being able to supply the requisite amount of force? The old maxim, "If you wish for peace, prepare for war," would apply with the same compulsion then as now.

M. Émile Faguet supplies the following answer to the question here raised: "Collectivism is a form of disarmament; it is even the most extreme form of

disarmament." The nation, therefore, first to adopt Collectivism will incur great risks. "Many philanthropists," proceeds M. Faguet, "have said, 'Let all the nations of the world disarm.' But no one, except perhaps M. Naquet and M. Hervé, have ventured to state, 'We French, or we Germans, or we English, let us disarm without waiting for the other nations to do the same.'"

The dangers, M. Faguet is of opinion, which will beset the first country which adopts Collectivism, will proceed *not* merely from the military, but *also from the economic disarmament which is inseparable from Collectivism.*[1] For Collectivism, as M. Faguet minutely shows in his work here quoted, necessarily entails the passage of a nation from a state of energy to one of profound indolence and sloth.

That this latter deduction is no idle surmise on the part of M. Faguet is abundantly proved by the downfall of Peru whilst a Socialist State.[2]

Prescott in his *Conquest of Peru* graphically records how a populous State, although possessing a large army, disciplined to a degree, fell an easy prey to a small body of Spaniards.

The circumstances responsible for the overthrow of the Peruvians have been fully explained by the distinguished sociologist, Dr. Letourneau, who has devoted special study to the conditions prevailing at that period in Peru.

"The monarchy of the Incas, of which we have already spoken," writes Dr. Letourneau in his work *Sociology*, "offers to the sociologist a most interesting

[1] See *Le Socialisme en* 1907, pp. 252, 253.
[2] See as to this, p. 161 *supra*.

subject for study. We find there the largest Communist society that has ever existed. . . ."[1]

Dr. Letourneau then proceeds to closely examine the principal features of the Peruvian State under Socialism, and thus concludes his analysis: "A superhuman power conducted everything, ruled everything, foresaw everything. *The subject was a simple machine, an automaton without initiative movement, bound to serve a superior caste,* and also an all-powerful master."[2]

One may predict, then, with confidence, supported by the teachings of past history, that the duration of a Socialist State in a world in which there still existed other non-Socialist States would be relatively brief. It would survive only until it fell a victim, as did Peru, to some other and more strenuous nation nurtured under a non-Socialist rule.

[1] Translated by H. M. Trollope, pp. 478 and 479.
[2] *Sociology*, p. 482, and see pp. 478–482.

XIV

SOCIALISM AND THE LAND

The Aims of Socialism

The steps by which the Socialist seeks to achieve his objects, if unable to obtain them at one fell swoop, are:—firstly by the taxation of land values; secondly, by the socialisation of land; and, lastly, by the socialisation of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange.

Surely it is time that all should realise that new and disastrous forces are undermining the Constitution, and are gathering head insidiously. The attack upon the land, as engineered by the Socialists, is only the preliminary to a general assault upon property in *all* forms, and the man who is content to say, "Why should I defend the land? I have no proprietary interest in land," should call to mind the old Roman simile of the bundle of faggots.

After the land there will follow in due course a raid upon all other forms of private property, and every one who has saved will be looted in order to make provision for those who either have not exerted themselves, or who consistently prefer agitation to productive labour.

Between the policy of the Socialists and that of

those who believe not only in the continuance, but in the extension, of the principle of individual ownership in land the issue is perfectly definite and clear. The former would totally abolish what the latter would seek not to curtail, but to extend. (This branch of the subject is dealt with further in the chapter on Agriculture.)

"It need hardly be said," writes Mr. Sidney Webb, "that schemes of 'free land,' peasant proprietorship, or leasehold enfranchisement find *no* place in the modern programme of the Socialist Radical or Social Democrat. They are survivals of the Individualistic Radicalism which is passing away." [1]

"On one point," Mr. Jowett, M.P., informs us in his recently-published *The Socialist and the City*, "he (the Socialist) is clear, that is, the retention of all land coming into public possession through transactions arising out of the necessity for achieving schemes of public improvement. Once thus possessed, such land, in the opinion of the Socialist, should not be resold. Leased it may properly be. . . ." [2]

It was this same attitude regarding the land which accounts for the Socialist opposition to the principle of purchase in the case of small holders under the Small Holdings Bill, 1907. On what grounds do the Socialist Party in the House of Commons justify their denunciation of rent, with the compelling of the small holder to remain in the position of a perpetual rent-paying tenant, as is the case under this Act?

In discussing the question of the land, Mr. Jowett, M.P., writes: "To the mind of the Socialist the one

[1] *Fabian Essays*, p. 56, note 1.
[2] *The Socialist and the City*, p. 22.

remedy for such evils of land monopoly is public ownership; he would, at once, put an end to the private holding of land, if that were possible. . . ."[1]

Pending the entire public ownership of land, the rating of site values is to be enforced, and as drastically as possible. "It is at this point that the Socialist," writes Mr. Jowett, "comes into agreement with land reformers who are not Socialists. They believe in taxing unearned increments. So does he. They believe in rating unoccupied land, as he does also."[2]

"The accepted method of land nationalisation," writes so prominent an English Socialist as Mr. Sidney Webb, "is the taxation of rental values. . . ."[3]

The land, pending its socialisation, is, according to the evolutionary Socialists, to be subjected to the heaviest taxation possible.

From Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., we learn that a tax of a penny in the pound on the *capital* value of land is to be made to furnish "a revenue of £25,000,000 a year" in the first Socialist Budget.[4]

The *full meaning* of this penny in the pound is apt to escape those not accustomed to the proposal. ". . . Though a penny in the pound does not sound much, it is taken on the capital value, and, therefore, with interest on capital at 4 per cent., would represent 2s. 1d. in the pound on the annual value. . . ."[5]

This, however, is unduly merciful in Mr. Snowden's eyes. "Indeed," he writes, "after the Imperial tax of

[1] *The Socialist and the City*, p. 21.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 27.
[3] *Socialism in England*, 3rd edition, p. 58.
[4] *The Socialist's Budget*, p. 82.
[5] *Land Nationalisation*, by Mr. Harold Cox, M.P., 2nd edition, p. 100.

a penny in the pound has been imposed, there remains abundant scope for the local authority to put in a just claim for a further contribution to local expenditure from site values. . . . The imposition of an Imperial tax of one penny in the pound on the capital value of the site would be a beginning, but by no means the end, of the process of diverting socially created rent of land into the public exchequer."[1]

The Taxation of Land Values, &c.

The subject of the taxation of land values, &c., since it is regarded by many Socialists as one of the steps to be taken towards securing their ultimate goal, consequently requires some consideration before passing to other Socialist aims in regard to the land.

The subject is one of considerable intricacy, and for this reason has received from the general public but a small degree of intelligent consideration.

Fortunately, however, this subject has been very fully inquired into by an exceptionally able Royal Commission which reported in 1901. The conclusion of the Majority of the Commissioners amounted to a total disapproval of the rating of land values. "The advocates of what would be in effect a new land tax, to be applied in aid of local expenditure," states the Majority Report, "have failed to convince us that it would be equitable to select a particular class of rateable property for the imposition of a new and special burden."

The principal Minority Report, to which there were five signatories, is in some respects even more

[1] *The Socialist's Budget*, p. 83.

important than that of the Majority, as it is to this Report that land taxers and raters so constantly point as an authoritative pronouncement in their favour.

In regard to urban rating and site values, this Minority Report stated that "Misconception and exaggeration are especially prevalent on this subject." This Minority Report also announced that "The value of the site as well as of the structure is at present assessed to rates." The Minority further expressly state: "*There is no large undeveloped source of taxation available* for local purposes, and still less for national purposes."

There is also a one-man Report signed by Mr. Arthur O'Connor. This is of special interest for two reasons—firstly, Mr. O'Connor was the sole member of the Royal Commission who was avowedly in sympathy with the late Mr. Henry George's theories; secondly, notwithstanding the extreme views contained in this Report, there is the express conclusion that "It is manifest that equity requires that all existing contracts should be absolutely respected." Mr. O'Connor develops this view, and gives it as his considered opinion that "a disregard of contractual relations would be a more serious injury to the public than even the existing system of rating." It should carefully be noted that every one of these Commissioners supported the maintenance of existing contracts.

The whole question hinges on common honesty. An honest man is the man whose word is his bond, and whose bond is carried out. An honest nation is the nation which respects and fulfils its obligations, and secures by its laws the sanctity of legal contracts.

The choice lies between Socialism and good citizenship, between the shameless violation of contracts and common honesty. The rating and taxation of site values has been condemned by the Majority of the Royal Commission. The proposal is illusionary, impracticable, and unjust in that it involves further burdens upon one form of property that is already taxed and rated to the utmost.

Further, the relief so afforded would in any case prove relatively insignificant. In further proof of this it may be stated that Lord Balfour of Burleigh, who was the chairman of the Royal Commission and one of the signatories of the Minority Report, found it necessary to state, at a public meeting held in Chelsea in February 1907, that greatly exaggerated hopes had been raised of a large fund of untaxed wealth to be derived from the rating of ground values; and Lord Balfour of Burleigh proceeded to announce, "There is no such source of revenue."

"No large undeveloped source of taxation available for local purposes, and still less for national purposes!"

Such is the express finding, as shown above, of this Minority Report.

Once this point is clearly grasped by the electors, namely, that this much vaunted scheme is not going to reduce the pecuniary burdens of the rest of the community, its popularity will simultaneously vanish.

Further, it would be well for Socialists and others alike to put forward a practical scheme for the rating of site values before prating further on this subject. The Minority Report of the Royal Commission,

in referring to the schemes in existence at that time, stated :—

> "We feel bound, for the reasons which we have explained, to condemn unhesitatingly all the schemes which have been put before us in connection with the rating of site values."

Socialists and others have time and again told the public that the taxing and rating of land values, &c., would provide a practically *unlimited* source of new revenue, and consequently would enable them to remedy, if not to eradicate, social evils of every sort, kind, and description.

The struggling ratepayer has been led to believe that the burden will be shifted on to other shoulders ; whilst the poorest of the electors have been taught that this would provide the means of effecting a social revolution with regard to the housing of the working-classes, and other matters of vital importance to them.

The Minority Report of this very Commission disproves every one of these fictions.

Misrepresentations in regard to "the monopoly of land," and the doctrine of "unearned increment," and other statements rendered popular by Mr. Henry George some twenty-five years ago, have won for these suggestions a wholly undeserved degree of popularity.

Far from being a proposal which will only injure the very rich, the taxing of land values, &c., will, in fact, detrimentally affect large numbers of small property owners and still larger numbers of the thrifty poor.

It would be a delusion to imagine that the Peers

practically comprise the freeholders of this country, for according to the new Domesday Book there were in 1874 in England and Wales alone, *exclusive of the Metropolis*, some 973,000 freeholders. And there is good reason to believe that this total has since that date been largely increased. In order, however, that this figure may not mislead, it is necessary to add that of this total in 1874 over 703,000 persons owned in each case *less than one acre*.[1]

In addition to those comprised in the foregoing total, there are besides hundreds of thousands of others in the United Kingdom who would be injuriously affected were the Socialistic proposals carried into effect. Trades-unions, industrial and provident societies, charities and hospitals, churches and chapels of all denominations, universities, colleges, and schools have large financial interests in land; whilst private persons who do not actually own land at all have in countless cases sums of money advanced on mortgage.

Take the case of one of the most prominent of the benefit societies. The investments in freehold ground rents as at December 31, 1906, of the Hearts of Oak Benefit Society amounted to £1,453,298. On the same date the Society numbered 289,614 members. Insurance companies also are possessors of enormous interests in land.

The Prudential Insurance Company, to cite but one concrete instance, published its balance sheet for the year ending December 31, 1906, in *The Times* of March 11, 1907. Of this Company's total assets,

[1] See as to this Mr. Harold Cox's *Land Nationalisation*, 2nd edition, pp. 34–37.

amounting to nearly £64,000,000, over £16,000,000 was invested in or upon the security of land.

In other words, over 5s. of its assets in every pound is directly secured on land. All this, besides indirectly other of its investments, would be injuriously affected by the taxation of ground values, &c.

In this Company the poorer classes are very largely insured, and it possesses an agency in practically every town and village throughout England.

In estimating the riches of the "idle capitalist," the modern Socialist agitator does not scruple to include the ground rents, &c., held by these friendly and insurance societies, &c. He thus seeks to blind the public to the best of his ability to the fact that the larger portion thus credited to the "capitalist" should rightly be credited to the poorer and industrial working classes.

A striking proof of the fact that the friendly societies recognise the extent to which taxation of land values would, unless specially exempted, detrimentally affect their interests, was recently furnished.

At the annual meeting of the Hearts of Oak Benefit Society, held in August 1907, representing a membership of more than 300,000, a resolution was *unanimously* carried requesting the Government, if they gave legislative effect to these proposals, "to take into consideration the desirability of exempting the friendly societies, . . . having in view the vast benefits these societies had conferred upon the country." [1]

The Morning Post of November 9, 1907, states: "An impression, assiduously fostered by Radical and

[1] *The Times*, August 10, 1907.

Socialist orators, prevails that the ground rents in the county of London are the property of a few individuals, and that by the simple expedient of a more or less confiscatory measure the enormous wealth derived from these values might be utilised for the benefit of 'the people' without detriment to any one except a few ducal landlords. Twelve years ago, however, at a time when the Progressives were in power, the London County Council ordered the compilation of a list of the ground landlords within its area, with the result that, according to official statistics, the number of holders of ground rents at present stands at 25,400, and by the time the list is completed it is expected that it will reach the large total of 30,000. To confiscate the property of 30,000 people is a large measure, especially when, as the returns already show, the average individual holding works out at $2\frac{5}{8}$ acres, and that many of the ground landlords of London are organisations connected with thrift, such as insurance companies and benefit and friendly societies. Though there are a few large estates in London, many of the holdings consist of a single house. In fact, London land has been largely split up in recent years, owing, to a great extent, to the development of outside areas and to the pulling down of old disused property and the consequent creation and selling of new ground values. The London County Council statistics have been compiled for reference purposes, and to facilitate its operations for the acquiring of property and the sanitary inspection of buildings. At the same time these figures will serve the useful purpose of showing that landed property in London, like all other forms

of property, is not the possession of a few, but is divided among all classes of the community."

The Earl of Rosebery was merely stating a fact which is in accordance with all the statistics bearing on this subject when he recently said, as he did on March 26, 1907, that: "Property is much more widely diffused than is generally supposed. You talk of taxing this and that, and fancy you are only taxing dukes, when as a matter of fact vast communities, co-operative societies of working men are deeply interested in the very subjects you propose somewhat hastily to tax."

Confiscatory Designs on the Land

No doubt whatsoever exists as to the purposes which the Socialists seek to achieve by the taxation of land values, &c. If only the taxation of land is raised to a point at which it becomes less onerous for the owner to abandon his property rather than to retain it, the problem of Socialistic acquisition is forthwith solved. There is no vulgar stealing in the matter; the owner is merely taxed out.

"The land being the storehouse of all the necessaries of life should be declared and treated as public property," states the programme of the Independent Labour Party in this country.

In order to acquire both land and industrial capital (which, by the way, let it be clearly realised, comprise practically the whole wealth situate in the country), two ways, so Mr. Philip Snowden recently apprised his readers, lie open. "The one way is, by the

municipal and national appropriation . . . of the land and industrial concerns." By this, presumably, is meant undisguised confiscation. "The second method is by Taxation."[1] Taxation, in short, is to be used as a means of expropriation.

"Startling as the cold-blooded declaration of the Socialist aim, and of the Socialist designs on taxation, may sound to those to whom they are unfamiliar," continues Mr. Snowden, "there is really nothing new suggested either in the principle or in the practice."[2]

That there is nothing new in the principle, as propounded by Socialists, undoubtedly conforms to fact. The danger lies not in the novelty of the designs, but in the ignorance regarding them and consequent indifference of those whom they directly and indirectly concern.

Further evidence on this plan of campaign was given to the following effect by the President of the "Scottish Land Restoration Union," before the Royal Commission on Local Taxation, April 14, 1898.

"*Q.* 16,175. What is to be the next step?

"*Ans.* Increase the tax upon the value of the ground.

"*Q.* 16,176. Until you take it all?

"*Ans.* Until you take 20s. in the pound."[3]

Another prominent witness, Bailie Ferguson, before the same Royal Commission, stated: "I hold that nothing short of 20s. in the pound will be a complete settlement of the question."

The reason why the taxation of land values has

[1] *The Socialist's Budget*, p. 2. [2] P. 3.
[3] See *Minutes of Evidence*, vol. iii., Scotland, p. 59.

received the support of the Land Nationalisation Society has been thus explained by the General Secretary of that Society, Mr. Joseph Hyder, in his work entitled *The Crux of the Land Question* (p. 16). "Every land nationaliser," states Mr. Hyder, in referring to the taxation of land values, "should assist this taxation reform in order to facilitate the State acquisition of the land upon the most favourable terms possible."

"Upon the most favourable terms"—this sentence is plainly equivalent to "on the terms most conducive to the ruin of the present holders."

Mr. Sidney Webb, long one of the leading Socialists in England, who has made a special study of the question, while approving of the division of rates between occupier and owner, and of the rating of land values, comes to the conclusion in his book, entitled *The London Programme*, published in 1891 (p. 200), that:—

". . . *It is doubtful whether any large addition to local revenues could rapidly be obtained from them* (*i.e.* the division of rates between owner and occupier, and the special rating of ground values) *without causing such a depreciation of the value of property as would inevitably be regarded as confiscation.*"

Mr. Webb also was one of the witnesses who gave evidence before the Royal Commission on Labour (November 17, 1892). From Mr. Webb's evidence on this occasion we quote the following:—

"*Q.* 3887. Supposing it [the rate] had to go so far as to amount to 20s. in the pound, what then?

"*Ans.* That is a consummation I should view without any alarm whatever.

"*Q.* 3888. The municipality then would have rated the owners out of existence, would it not?

"*Ans.* That is so."[1]

The Bogus Cry of Compensation

At this stage the question of expropriation accompanied by compensation demands brief consideration. This is a proposition to which the evolutionary Socialists in particular at times give expression. For example, Mr. Jowett, M.P., speaks of "... Socialists while recognising the expediency in all, and the justice in some cases, of paying for land, rather than confiscating it ..."[2]

Mr. Robert Blatchford emphatically says the owners in *no* case have a right to the land. "Now, if a man has a right to nothing but that which he has himself made, no man can have a right to the land, for no man made it."[3]

The kind of compensation which at best would be made by a party, a considerable proportion of which advocate the repudiation of the National Debt, is not difficult to forecast. As Mr. Blatchford writes, "... My only hope is that it" (the compensation) "would be kept as low as possible."[4] It should "not be at fancy prices,"[5] further writes the same authority.

As previously indicated, there is no suggestion of compensation on the part of Socialists to the

[1] See *Minutes of Evidence*, p. 263.
[2] *The Socialist and the City*, p. 24.
[3] *Merrie England*, p. 60.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 107.
[5] *Britain for the British*, p. 89.

landlord, on whose rent a rate or tax of 20s. in the pound is levied; whilst, so far as Land Nationalisation or Socialisation is concerned, the late Mr. Gladstone's words, though uttered many years since, apply with equal force to-day.

Speaking at Hawarden on September 23, 1889, Mr. Gladstone said: "I think the nationalisation of the land, if it means the simple plunder of the proprietors, and sending them to the workhouse —that I consider is robbery. I think nationalisation of the land with compensation, as far as I can understand it, would be folly, because the State is *not* qualified to exercise the functions of a landlord. . . . It would overburden and break down the State."[1]

Even accepting the most favourable view, compensation, as shown elsewhere (p. 149), would at best in the Socialist State merely consist of the grant to the expropriated owner for life of a certain quantity of necessaries. It would in no case be adequate compensation.

Land Nationalisation and Socialisation

It next becomes necessary to deal with the subject of Land Nationalisation proper. In the first place it is important to clearly realise that there is, in the strict signification of the terms, a vast difference between Land Nationalisation and the Socialisation of the land. Land Nationalisation is advocated by the Land Nationalisation Society—some of the members of which body are Socialists, but many of them are Individualists.

[1] *The Times*, September 24, 1889.

The objects of this Society are summarised as follows :—

To abolish landlordism and make the land the inalienable property of the whole nation.

To place the land under the control of representatives and responsible authorities.

To apply its annual rental value to services of public advantage.

To establish the equal right of all men to the use of the earth.

These objects are beyond doubt highly suggestive of Socialism in several particulars, but they are non-Socialistic in so far as they recognise individual occupancy and the payment of rent. In these respects, so far from abolishing landlordism, they would merely sanction landlordism in another form. The difference would be that the Government would become the landlord in the place of an individual, and the rent would in future be payable to a Government Department.

On the other hand, under Socialisation instead of individual occupiers, there would be associated workers. These men would have no interest of a permanent character in any portion of land.

One and all they would merely be State labourers, and on the same footing as is the casual agricultural labourer to-day. Agricultural machinery, farm buildings, and the produce of the land would all belong entirely to the State. No rent would be paid to the State, for the reason that the State would be farming its own acres.

It should be noted that Land Nationalisation has acquired a definite meaning in politics, and the words

summarise the policy of the Land Nationalisation Society. Socialists, however, employ the same words on occasion when they should rightly speak of "Land Socialisation." No Socialist society would accept Land Nationalisation as a permanent settlement of the Land Question. Some Socialists welcome Nationalisation in the belief that it would prove to be a considerable step towards the realisation of their larger aims.

There are three different groups, and each group has a different, and, in essentials, contradictory policy with regard to the land, viz. :—

1. The Socialists. These would abolish both individual ownership and individual occupation of land. The soil of the country, according to Socialist tenets, should be cultivated by means of productive associations, or rural communes.

2. The Land Nationalisation Society, presided over by Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace.

This Society seeks to universalise occupying ownership of land, and to render it the sole form of occupancy. In its own words it "was established in 1881 to equitably restore the land to the people and the people to the land."

3. The followers of Henry George. These have formed themselves into the "English Land Restoration League." This Society seeks to totally abolish individual ownership of land, but would leave untouched individual occupancy.[1] (The origin of these two societies is dealt with in the chapter on the "History of Socialism in England," p. 16.)

In one most important respect the doctrines of the

[1] See Mr. Rae's *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, pp. 487, 488.

late Henry George differ entirely from those of the modern Socialist. In proposing to convert all landowners into tenants of the State, Mr. George would none the less guarantee to them security of possession, on the ground that complete security of tenure is essential in order that land may be put to the most profitable use.

Land Nationalisation and the Ulterior Aims of Socialism as regards Capital in general

The Socialists for the most part are sufficiently outspoken as to their ulterior intentions. That Land Nationalisation is only a step in the movement is made abundantly evident by Socialist writings and utterances in this and in other countries. In this connection Fabian Tract, No. 7, is explicit to a degree. It was published in 1904.

This Tract is nothing less than an appeal to Land Nationalisers to carry the faith that is in them to its logical conclusion. We quote as follows: "Some who are thus far land nationalisers still shrink from any interference with the legal powers enjoyed by the holders of capital. Hence a most unfortunate separation exists between them and the Socialists, whose design of nationalising the industrial capital with the land appears to them unjustifiable and unessential." In the next paragraph the authors of this Tract proceed to demonstrate that the capitalist and the landlord are, to use their own words, "in one boat."

Up to this point the Socialist authors of this Tract

have omitted to give a definition of what is Capital. They hasten to remedy this omission. "When we consider what is usually called capital," they write, "we are as much at a loss to disentangle it from land as we are to find land which does not partake of the attributes of capital."

After this instructive statement, the Tract writers proceed to quote official returns of income-tax assessments to prove how comparatively small a proportion of the total national wealth is represented by the land. The next step is to convince their readers that "land" and "capital" are indistinguishable. In support of this contention they state: "It may be noticed that there is no attempt in this table to distinguish between what land nationalisers might think should be classed as land, and what they would admit to be capital. The common sense of the ordinary business man and statistician recognises that *such distinction is impracticable and arbitrary*. To the business man they are both equally forms of property, merely different kinds of investments—that is, arrangements for obtaining a revenue from the labour of others."

The next question that is put by the writers of this Tract is, "Who own all this land and capital?" The answer is at once given, "The landlords and capitalists."

Of course, the conclusion sought to be arrived at by this chain of reasoning is that the reader should be induced to believe that the whole wealth of the nation is in the hands of the very rich. To this end the thrifty workman, who has merely a matter of £20 or so invested in a Building Society or in

a Savings Bank, is promptly branded as being a "capitalist."

One of the next links in the chain is to show that "Land Reform" is only "a partial remedy." As the result of Land Nationalisation, or, as it is here pleasingly described, "Land restoration," we are told that "Society" will be "relieved, but not freed."

Having to their own satisfaction, at any rate, proved this much, there forthwith follows an appeal to Land Nationalisers to go the necessary step further, and to throw in their lot entirely with the out-and-out Socialists.

"We appeal," state the authors of this Tract, "therefore, to land nationalisers to consider their reason for hesitating to work with us for the nationalisation of capital, on the ground that the evolution of industry has rendered *land and capital indistinguishable* and equally indispensable as instruments of production. . . . "

That land is indistinguishable from capital in other forms has long been recognised and proclaimed by Socialists. To give some examples :—

In a debate on the Single Tax, Mr. H. Quelch of the Social Democratic Federation stated : "Then Mr. Wright attempts to set up a distinction between land and capital. There is no such distinction, and it is impossible to separate the two."[1] Mr. Quelch on this occasion went on to state, "Rent, like everything else, is produced by labour, and is secured by the exploitation of labour."[2]

"Chamberlain has got his money apart from land ;

[1] *Socialism and the Single Tax* (published by the Twentieth Century Press), pp. 7 and 8.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

the same with Rothschild and all wealthy men. The workers are robbed of 1000 millions a year at the lowest computation. The landlords, at the highest computation, that of Mr. Wright and his friends, only get 200 millions. We say the immediate robber, the capitalist, takes the lot; he keeps 800 millions, and to keep the landlord quiet gives him 200 millions, or less."[1]

Mr. H. M. Hyndman, one of the original founders of the Social Democratic Federation of Great Britain, is charmingly impartial in his attitude towards landlords, as is shown by the following extracts:—

"We do not particularly hate landlords more than capitalists, or capitalists more than landlords. The alligator and the crocodile, it matters not which it is from the point of view of those upon whom they feed."[2] "The landlord, after all, in this country and even in America, is," continues Mr. Hyndman, "but a sleeping partner in the process of expropriation which is carried on at the expense of the workers. If you kill the sleeping partner and leave the active one at work, what the better are you? . . . Even from the ethical point of view, *if you are going, as a matter of fact, to tax income from land, why not tax income from all robbery of labour?*"[3]

In much the same refrain spoke Mr. Bernard Shaw at a Conference organised by the Land Nationalisation Society, and held on October 13, 1906: "If they taxed landlords who did some work for their money, and left untaxed those who . . . did nothing

[1] *Socialism and the Single Tax*, p. 14.
[2] *The Single Tax* v. *Social Democracy*, p. 12 (Twentieth Century Press).
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

for a living except cut off coupons now and again, they would create an enormous sense of injustice."[1]

To much the same effect writes another prominent Socialist, Mr. W. D. P. Bliss.

"Why should one man who has invested his money in land have its value taken from him, and not the man who has invested his money in a factory? . . . Justice, practical necessity, expediency, and the divine law all call for the similar socialisation of capital of every kind."[2]

The foregoing extracts should go far towards convincing the most obtuse that every form of private property is threatened by Socialism, and that their attacks are not merely confined to landed property.

The Doctrines of Henry George

Mr. Henry George's doctrines have still a very considerable number of followers. Mr. George would destroy individual ownership, but would leave individual occupation intact.

In referring to Mr. Henry George, Professor Lecky writes: ". . . No Continental writer ever advocated dishonesty to national creditors with a more unblushing cynicism. At the same time capital, as distinguished from landowning, does not occupy in his system the same position as in the treatise of Marx. In the demonology of Marx the capitalist is the central figure. . . . According to Mr. George he can ultimately absorb none of this wealth, unless he happens to be a landowner. The interest and profits of the capitalist, as well as the wages of the

[1] *The Daily Chronicle*, October 15, 1906.
[2] *Handbook of Socialism*, p. 188.

labourer, can never in the long run increase while land remains private property."[1]

In his *Progress and Poverty*[2] (Bk. VI. ch. i.), Mr. George, for example, gravely assures his readers that the whole benefit of the increase in wealth in England during the preceding twenty to thirty years had gone to the landowners.

A gospel which depicts the most successful banker or merchant as being rapidly ruined by the all-devouring landlord, in the face of every-day experience, sufficiently refutes itself. The doctrine, in short, is opposed absolutely to all the facts which to-day in practice obtain.

In 1893 Mr. Mallock estimated that the entire landed rental of this country was less than $\frac{1}{13}$ of the total income, whilst that of the larger landed proprietors amounted to less than $\frac{1}{39}$ part.[3]

If Mr. George's reasonings were correct as applied to this country, the rental of our titled and untitled aristocracy would in 1893, Mr. Mallock calculated, have amounted to about £800,000,000. This estimate exceeded the true amount "by no less a sum than £770,000,000."[4]

"It is a significant fact," wrote Professor Lecky, "that while Mr. George in his first book only proposed to rob the landowner, in his second book he proposed *equally to rob the fund-owner*, being now convinced that the institution of public debts and private property in land rested on the same basis."[5]

[1] *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 358.
[2] First published in 1877.
[3] *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, pp. 253, 254.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[5] *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. i. p. 216.

The propagandist effect of Mr. George's work is thus summarised from the Socialist standpoint by Mr. Hyndman: "Intelligent people," writes Mr. H. M. Hyndman, "who eagerly read *Progress and Poverty*, with its light pleasant style . . . were almost forced to go forward to Socialism; though they might shrink back, as most of them did, when they discovered whither they were mentally drifting. Henry George, therefore, acted quite unconsciously as a valuable propagandist for ideas almost entirely in opposition to his own."[1]

The Present Division of the Land

At this stage it may be well to emphasise that the present division of land in this country, though gravely exaggerated by the Socialists, nevertheless, it is submitted, constitutes a serious danger as tending directly to promote the growth of Socialism in Great Britain.

According to a recent statement made by Viscount Ridley, no less than one-third of the land in England is owned by members of the House of Lords. It is true that Earl Carrington, the present Minister for Agriculture, estimates the proportion at one-fifth. Even if we accept the smaller computation, and make the necessary allowance for the fact that much of this property is moorland and mountain and not suited to agriculture at all, yet the division of property in land as it exists in this country to-day leaves much to be desired. Socialism is an unclean spirit

[1] *The Single Tax* v. *Social Democracy* (Twentieth Century Press), Introduction, p. 4.

that wanders in waste places. It is driven out by the man who is farming his own acres. We have been described as being a nation of shopkeepers; we shall be on economically sounder ground when we become a nation of small holders, or rather of yeomen farmers.

"Such a movement as this," writes so eminent an authority as Dr. Schäffle, in reference to Land Nationalisation, "is intelligible *in England* or in California, where large estates stand in the way of peasant proprietorship, and where nationalisation would result, *not* in an enduring State ownership of the soil, but in the practical reconstitution of the farmer as a peasant proprietor."[1]

Professor Woolsey, who has devoted a lifetime to the study of Socialism, gives it as his opinion that ". . . the safety of the State and of private property seems to demand that large landed estates must be somehow or other broken up, and the number of persons owning the soil be greatly increased in those countries where now the landlords are comparatively few, and that as speedily as economic rules will allow."[2]

In another passage Professor Woolsey declared that "If the agitation now so rife in parts of Europe should have the effect of subdividing the large estates and of converting tenants into proprietors, it would be a blessing for all time."[3]

The late Professor Lecky, whose sympathy with the rights of property cannot be seriously called

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, p. 203.
[2] *Communism and Socialism*, pp. 274 and 275.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 287.

in question, has equally commented on the danger which this state of affairs to-day in England presents.

"In England this bulwark does not exist, for, although the legal owners have been shown to be a much larger body than had been frequently alleged, and although the real owners who hold charges on the land are very numerous, the *ostensible* ownership of the soil is in the hands of a comparatively small class. . . . Nothing, I think, can be clearer," emphatically concludes Professor Lecky, "than that *in a democratic State land should be in many hands.*" [1]

Mr. Jesse Collings, M.P., whose authority to speak on all questions affecting the land ranks high, in his recently published *Land Reform* has similarly referred at length to this existing danger. In Mr. Collings' opinion it is urgently necessary that active steps should be taken to encourage the development of peasant proprietorship in Great Britain.

So competent an authority on agriculture as Mr. R. A. Yerburgh, in a recent article dealing with the land question, writes: "We next come to the promotion of individual ownership. One of the strongest arguments in favour of the adoption of this method of dealing with the problem is, in my view, furnished by the opposition with which it meets from the advocates of State ownership of the land. *The concentration of land in a few hands,* with the consequent divorce of the mass of the people from the soil, *furnishes them with invaluable material for stirring,* and picturesque appeals to, *the prejudice of the masses.* With the extension of general opportunities on the easiest terms for

[1] *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 484.

individual ownership, their case would lose its real prop." [1]

Whilst the fact that so large a proportion of the land in country districts is owned by a relatively small number of individuals, constitutes in this country a material assistance in the spreading of the Socialist creed, other forms of landed property present an even greater danger. The existence of vast *urban* estates constitutes, it is submitted, a still more powerful lever in the growth of Socialism. This view receives emphatic corroboration on the part of many competent authorities.

Professor Lecky has thus referred to the subject now under review: "There is one form of agglomerated property which probably endangers the security of property in England much more than the great country estates. It is the vast town properties, which are in England in a very few hands, and which being let at long leases, have risen enormously in value, owing to the general prosperity and efforts of the community. . . . It is this form of property which . . . lends itself most readily to Socialistic attacks."

Professor Lecky proceeds to further enforce the disadvantages of this system of ground-landlordism, as, for example: "The immense increase of value, which is not due to any exertion on the part of the owner; the power which a selfish or unwise owner may exercise in obstructing the development of the community."

These and other reasons to which he refers lead Professor Lecky to the decisive conclusion, that "It is greatly to be wished that the large town landlords

[1] *The Fortnightly Review*, October 1907.

would generally follow the example, which has been set by a few members of their class, and make it their policy to convert, on equitable terms, their long leases into freeholds." [1]

The Subdivision of the Land as a Barrier against Socialism

That the extensive division of the ownership of the land constitutes a most effective bulwark against Socialism in those countries in which it exists, is the teaching of all Continental history.

M. Thiers, the Ex-President of the French Republic, was accustomed to say about small holders, that "Every acre of land in the hands of a small holder furnishes a musket for the protection of property." [2]

Dr. Schäffle, too, has described the peasantry as "the class which of all others is the bulwark against Collectivism," and "the unflinching support of a truly individualist industrial system." [3]

The reason for this is not far to seek.

Mr. Rae has accurately summed up the position with which Continental Socialists are faced in a single sentence. "The peasant, perplexing creature, is labourer and capitalist too." [4]

Socialists themselves have not been slow to recognise the truth of this conclusion. Engels, the life-long friend and coadjutor of Marx, was invincibly

[1] *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. ii. p. 495.
[2] Quoted in Mr. Jesse Collings' *Land Reform*, p. 228.
[3] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, p. 283.
[4] *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 513.

hostile to making the working-man owner of his house, and, if living in the country, of a small garden. This he characterised as the *bourgeois* solution, and as a trick to enable the capitalist to buy his labour more cheaply.[1]

The true reason of Engels' hostility was, there can be little doubt, that he, like many other prominent Socialist thinkers, clearly realised how opposed to the growth of Socialism must inevitably be any such movement.

So important, in fact, is the bearing of peasant or yeoman proprietorship on Socialism as to justify somewhat detailed reference.

". . . The Social Democrats," writes so leading an expert on International Socialism as Mr. Rae, in referring to Germany, "generally admit that the social revolution is impossible without the adherence of the peasantry."[2]

France, so Mr. Rae is also of opinion, "enjoys a solid security against the successful advance of Socialism in her peasant proprietors."[3]

If peasant proprietorship is to remain an effective barrier against Socialism, it is essential that the small properties should *not* be encumbered by mortgages. It is essential, also, that their management should be attended by, at all events, a fair degree of success.

In referring to the German Social Democratic Party, Mr. Thomas Kirkup states: "But they do not despair of also winning over the peasant owners,

[1] See Mr. Arthur Raffalovich's article in *A Plea for Liberty*, p. 278, footnote.

[2] *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 43.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

many of whom are heavily burdened with mortgages."[1]

In referring once again to the German Social Democratic Party, Mr. Kirkup thus summarises their principal point of objective at the present time.

"Their main aim," he writes, "is to win the whole working class for Socialism. In this aim their prospect of success depends on how far they can win over the Catholic working-men and the rural population."[2]

It is the aim of the policy of the Socialist Party to endeavour to rectify as speedily as possible causes which tend to handicap their progress. With this end in view, no lack of inducements for the peasant proprietors to throw in their lot with the Socialists have been wanting on the part of the latter.

M. Gabriel Deville, the great French Socialist, in his *Aperçu sur le Socialisme scientifique*, at the commencement of his translation of Marx's *Capital*, announces that, immediately on the Socialists' accession to power, for the peasant proprietors will be proclaimed the abolition of all their debts *other than* mortgage, the suppression of their taxes, and the reduction of their mortgages by fifty per cent., &c.

The peasant will then be permitted to retain to himself his land, until such time as either in consequence of the competition of the large properties already socialised, or owing to the advantages which he will see accrue from the Collective cultivation of

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 315.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 317.

the soil, he is voluntarily induced to renounce the exclusive ownership of his small piece of land.

There is no question, then, asserts M. Deville, of either compulsion or persuasion in the peasant's case. The course of events above described will, it is assumed by the Socialists, be of themselves sufficient to achieve the Socialists' ultimate aims.[1]

Following on the Social Democratic Congress held at Frankfurt in 1894, a Socialist Committee was specially appointed to consider the agrarian policy of the German Social Democratic Party. This Committee reported in favour of the peasant being left in possession of his property, whilst nationalisation was to be confined to the large estates only. In addition, State banks were to be established, with a view to taking over the mortgages of the peasants, and to charge only the lowest possible rate of interest.

The Breslau Congress of 1895 refused, however, to ratify this proposal as tending to perpetuate the peasants in their properties, and consequently to increase, rather than to diminish, their love of property.

French Socialists meantime had found it necessary to adopt as part of their programme the continuance of peasant proprietorship (Congress of Nantes, 1894).[2]

In view of Socialist proposals, such as the above, for overcoming the opposition of the peasant proprietor, M. Émile Faguet arrives at the carefully weighed conclusion that, so far as France is concerned, a Socialist revolution is "*but little probable*," owing to the peasant proprietors being difficult, all allowances

[1] See *Le Socialisme en* 1907, by M. Émile Faguet, pp. 331, 332.
[2] See Mr. Rae's *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, pp. 513, 514.

made, to seduce. But that such a revolution is still "*very possible.*"[1]

In short, as here previously stated, success must attend the agricultural industry, if peasant proprietorship is to remain actively opposed to Socialism.

Socialist Misstatements regarding the Land

We have here referred to a subject which, it is believed, requires the urgent attention of all who are opposed to Socialism, and who, at the same time, have no wish to blind themselves to the undoubted fact that Socialism to-day is very largely increasing the number of its supporters in Great Britain. In so doing we have naturally no wish to do otherwise than combat the vastly exaggerated statements to which Socialist speakers and writers habitually give expression in relation to the land question.

It is, however, high time to recognise, and, if possible, to repair without delay all that tends to aid the Socialist propaganda.

Mr. Mallock draws attention to an important fact, which is invariably overlooked, when he states that though the large landowners of this country hold a preponderating part of the land in point of *area*, in point of *value* their holdings represent *less than one-third of the total.*[2]

The entire rental derived from land would, if divided among the population of this country, Mr. Mallock estimates, give each man about 2d. per day;[3]

[1] See *Le Socialisme en* 1907, p. 335.
[2] *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, p. 43.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

whilst "out of the ruin of every park, manor, and castle in the country each adult male would receive less than ¾d. daily."[1]

In the Middle Ages income from land represented the chief source of wealth. Even as late as the year 1814, the incomes of the landlords and farmers of this country constituted 56 per cent. of the total assessed to income tax. This percentage in 1880 had sunk to 24, and in 1892 to 16.[2]

That the tendency is for land to represent a diminishing proportion of the total wealth of the country is generally admitted by Socialists, except when they find it convenient to blind the public to the fact; but it is invariably ignored by Land Nationalisers, using the term in its strict sense.

The Cry of "Land Monopoly"

The "monopoly of land" cry is one which the Socialists have always found most effective for purposes of popular agitation. Seeing that all sections of the community have investments in land, and that thousands of acres are at all times upon the market, it cannot truthfully be suggested by Socialists that landowners constitute a close corporation, and that there is a monopoly in land generally.

Undoubtedly, under existing conditions persons at times find difficulty in becoming possessed of the particular plot of land that their fancy may have chanced upon. In this sense a monopoly

[1] *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, by Mr. W. H. Mallock, p. 46.
[2] *Ibid.* Note to p. 42.

undoubtedly does exist in regard to land, but it consists merely as a monopoly *in a particular piece* of land, and no more.

It would be well for those who unthinkingly may feel inclined to give a vote to Socialism, on the score of "land monopoly," to first clearly realise what the Socialist really means when he talks of "monopoly."

In *Merrie England* Mr. Robert Blatchford propounds the doctrine of Socialism and monopoly as follows: "Just as no man can have a right to the land, because no man makes the land, so no man has a right to his self, because he did not make that self."[1]

No more effective weapon for the abrogation of all personal liberty in regard to the individual could be found than this doctrine of "monopoly" as interpreted by the Socialist.

Socialist orators who attempt to win public support for the Socialisation of the land frequently descant upon the need of obtaining access to the land. It is on the presumed denial of such access that they largely ground their appeals. They will find difficulty in reconciling such a position with the following dictum of Mr. H. Quelch of the Social Democratic Federation.

"Millions of acres of land during the last few years have gone out of cultivation," states Mr. Quelch. "It is free; there is nothing to shut you out. In many cases you can have it almost rent free."[2]

Further, the total of reported sales of real property by auction and private treaty over the United Kingdom, for the twelve months ending

[1] *Merrie England*, p. 75.
[2] *Socialism and the Single Tax*, p. 7.

August 31, 1907, amounted to £6,780,000, being a decrease upon the figures of the last year of £1,420,620.[1]

Socialists for the most part not only habitually vastly overstate the difficulty which they assert is experienced to-day in obtaining land in the United Kingdom, but similarly exaggerate the condition in this respect throughout the entire world.

In describing the condition of "the proletariat," Mr. Bernard Shaw asserts, ". . . there appears in the land a man in a strange plight—one who wanders from snow-line to sea-coast in search of land, and finds none that is not the property of some one else." [2]

How does this highly-coloured picture, to which Socialists so often treat their audiences, coincide with the facts of to-day?

To cite but one instance, Canada (subject to certain regulations regarding the cultivation of the land) is offering to any able-bodied man a holding of 160 acres. The supply, far from being limited, extends *to areas many times the size of the United Kingdom.* It is now demonstrated by actual experience that for hundreds of miles north of where the bulk of the population is now settling, in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta in Western Canada, wheat can be grown of the finest quality, in addition to various other cereals, &c.

The position in other parts of the world similarly to-day goes to disprove this grotesque picture of Mr. Bernard Shaw.

[1] See *The Morning Post*, October 10, 1907.
[2] "The Economic Basis of Socialism." *Fabian Essays*, p. 9.

What, then, is there to prevent Socialists, either individually or in groups, if their craving for land is so absorbing, from availing themselves of such golden opportunities, unless it be the condition which necessitates the expenditure of labour?

The short fact is that though Socialists assert habitually that land is land, and represent all land as the gift solely of nature; *in practice*, Socialists recognise, quite as clearly as do their opponents, the important differences which separate land in the highest state of improvement, and which in every part bears evidence of the intelligent expenditure of capital, on the one hand, from land in a wholly uncultivated condition.

"Some of the richest land in England lies in the fen country, and that land is as much the product," writes Mr. Rae, "of engineering skill and prolonged labour as Portland Harbour and Menai Bridge."[1]

It is this kind of land, after it has been brought to the highest state of perfection, which the Socialist covets and seeks to appropriate. In denying that land is in any way the product of capital, the Socialist's action gives the lie to his words. For not only would the Socialist confiscate the land, but with it the buildings, implements, machinery, and the other necessities which capital has provided, and which only the judicious expenditure of capital can provide.

One of the chief facts in regard to which Socialists habitually seek to intentionally mislead their audiences is, that land is in no sense more a gift of nature than is any other commodity.

[1] *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, pp. 492, 493.

No cultivated land exists anywhere that is not the product of much labour. The distinction, therefore, between land and other products of labour must, as Mr. Rae enforces, be sought, *not* in the expenditure of labour, but in the fact that it is both limited in quantity and at the same time essential to the production of the general necessaries of life.[1]

"Unearned Increment"

The cry of "unearned increment" is the next which requires consideration. At the outset it should be observed that if there be in some cases "unearned increment" in regard to land, the same thing applies equally to many other forms of property. Socialists, however, do not stop to quibble about any such mere excrescence as "unearned increment." It is not the land but the rents they in reality covet. "All property is theft" has for long been one of their favourite maxims. They seek to annihilate the whole of private ownership in land, and in every other form of property as well.

Mr. Leone Chiozza Money, M.P., in speaking at the National Liberal Club in London on February 27, 1905, stated: "Where is the moral difference between the man who puts his ten thousand pounds into tea-shop shares and draws a large income for doing nothing, and the man who puts it into land and draws a smaller one?"

It will be seen that Socialists and quasi-Socialists, like gamblers, are never tired of prating about gains,

[1] *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 494.

but they make a point of never alluding to losses. If for £10,000 we read £10, the ordinary "man in the street" will realise the danger that at the hands of the Socialists threatens him. At the present time he is not directly a holder of land as a rule, and is, in many instances, not as yet aware that his savings are as much in peril under Socialism as are the rich man's acres. The doctrine of "unearned increment" in its logical development would detrimentally affect him just as much. Any adventitious accretion to his savings is to be labelled "unearned increment," and promptly appropriated by the State, but there is to be no compensation from the same source for loss or shrinkage. "Heads I win; tails you lose," is the call of the Socialists.

The larger portion of the land in this country is agricultural land, and to talk to-day of "unearned increment" in connection with agricultural land in England or in other parts of the United Kingdom is ironical indeed.

The Royal Commissioners referred to this matter in the Report on Agriculture which they issued in 1898, and estimated the decrease in the capital value of land in the United Kingdom at upwards of one hundred millions sterling. A later, though non-official, estimate was given in a paper read before the Royal Statistical Society by Mr. Inglis Palgrave in February 1905. According to this authority the estimate of the losses during the period 1872–77 to 1904 amounted to the gigantic figure of sixteen hundred millions.[1]

[1] See The Royal Statistical Society's *Journal*, March 1905, p. 60.

Mr. Palgrave apportioned these losses as follows, viz. :—

Diminution in Owners' Capital . .	£1,000,000,000
„ „ Farmers' Capital . .	100,000,000
„ „ Farmers' Profits . .	500,000,000
Total . .	£1,600,000,000

The official Agricultural Returns afford further proof of this decrease in value. Contrasting the year 1869–70 (the earliest year with which these returns deal), with the year 1904–5 (the latest year available), the annual decrease in the gross income derived from the ownership of lands in Great Britain, as returned under Schedule A of the Income Tax, exceeds £12,463,000. The same Return further shows that in the short period 1897 to 1905 the annual rateable value of agricultural land in England and Wales, as defined by the Agricultural Rates Acts, 1896, shows a decrease of £606,000.[1]

Mr. John Morley, M.P., the present Secretary of State for India, whose authority as an economist cannot well be challenged, speaking at Manchester on October 19, 1903, said: "Nobody denies that there has been a fall in the rents of the landlords."[2]

Professor Thorold Rogers is an expert whom Socialists frequently quote with admiration. It is noteworthy that when Professor Rogers was asked before the Town Holdings Committee in 1890 whether he advocated the imposition of a tax on real property, on the ground of what is called "unearned increment," he replied, "Oh, no; I do not know what it means.

[1] See Agricultural Statistics, 1906, Cd. 3281 of 1906, pp. 88, 89.
[2] *All Sides of the Fiscal Controversy*, p. 145.

It is not much now. I think there is an unexpected decrement as far as I can make out." [1]

Surely if it be fair for the State in the name of "unearned increment" to deprive a man of accretions that have come to his property without effort on his part, it is equally just that the State should return to the property owner losses which have accrued through no fault of his own. The late Professor Fawcett, who was, at one time, a Minister under the late Mr. Gladstone, held the same view, and gave expression to it in his *Political Economy*, in which he wrote: "If the State appropriated the unearned increment, would it not be bound to give compensation if land became depreciated through no fault of its owner, but in consequence of a change in the general circumstances of the country? . . . If, therefore, the State in prosperous times appropriates an increase in value, and if in adverse times the falling off in value has to be borne by the owner, land would at once have a disability attached to it which belongs to no other property." [2]

In a speech the late Sir William Harcourt, M.P., once declared, "I shall not discuss with you 'the unearned increment' of land. That is an idea so illogical, so unreasonable, so perfectly unjust, and so absolutely 'philosophical,' that it does not require a refutation. Neither shall I inquire into the nature and origin of property in land. I am content to assume that a man's right to his land depends on the same principle as your right to the coat on your back, namely, that you have paid for it." [3]

[1] See Report, Town Holdings Committee, 1890, p. 168.
[2] *Manual of Political Economy*, 6th edition, 1883, p. 286.
[3] Oxford, January 1, 1874. *The Times* report.

The Socialists' Claim to the Land

The arguments on which Socialists rest their claim to the land next require attention.

It is a noticeable fact that with Socialists, when the question of the land is uppermost, history dates only from the accession of William the Conqueror. 1066, A.D., for this purpose represents with Socialists the *ne plus ultra* of history.

If land is "stolen," to right such wrong it must *either* become the property of humanity at large, *or* it becomes necessary for each individual to prove affirmatively his descent from the original rightful owners. The first alternative is directly rejected by Socialists, in that they propose after the advent of Socialism to enforce restrictions on alien immigration into their territory. The world's right is, therefore, directly denied by Socialists.

So far as the second alternative is concerned, it is quite impossible in a country such as the United Kingdom, with its numerous past conquests and migrations, for any of the present inhabitants to prove any such claim. Similarly, if the law of prescription in regard to land is to have *no* power to confer a valid title on an individual (which represents the Socialist contention), *it must be equally powerless in the case of communities.*

Socialistic doctrines in regard to the land involve their followers in equal difficulties as regards other parts of the world. So far as North and South America, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and many other parts of the inhabited world are

concerned, recent history goes conclusively to prove that none of the white races at present in possession of these territories can by descent make good any such title as Socialist doctrines would demand. Yet if it is right and just for one body of men to withhold from another race the possession of land, it becomes impossible for Socialists to substantiate on the ground of monopoly their claim against land ownership under the present system.

Experience to-day conclusively demonstrates that inequalities of fortune are almost as conspicuous in the case of nations as in the case of individuals. Compare, for example, the Esquimaux and the Argentines, or the people of New Zealand with those of Alaska. Inequalities of fortune in regard to groups of individuals can no more be justified by Socialists than in regard to individuals considered separately.

Further, if Socialist leaders, for example in England, feel justified, through alien restrictions, in excluding the rest of the world from sharing in the possession of some of the richest lands which the world contains, in the name of the same right what is there to prevent them from specially reserving to themselves some of the choicest portions of these same lands?

Mr. W. H. Mallock clearly shows to what gross absurdities the Socialist form of argument in regard to the land logically leads.

What natural justice is by most Socialists supposed to teach is that special sections of the human race are the collective owners *severally* of certain special parts of the world.

When Mr. Hyndman calls his book *England for All*,

Mr. Blatchford takes for the title to one of his works *Britain for the British*, and Mr. Victor Grayson placards his constituency with "Ours for Us," they none of them mean to imply that the territory thus designated or indicated belongs to the whole world.[1]

According to this form of argument the Laplander, if at the time of "the social revolution" he chances to be in Lapland, then he and his descendants must henceforth for ever content themselves with such land as that inhospitable region comprises.

The Socialist would denounce as a scandalous monoply the ownership, say, of some small island on the West of Scotland by an individual. But if its inhabitants number ten, and claim it for themselves collectively, the Socialist can urge no claim against their ownership except "might is right."

Again, it necessarily follows that if England is the *sole* property of the English, and a like title is conferred on the inhabitants throughout the rest of the world, all immigration becomes dependent on the consent of the inhabitants of the country in question.

Were the whole world to adopt Socialism and self-government still to continue in the various parts, an individual wishing to emigrate might conceivably find himself surrounded by a ring fence, and be unable to obtain access to any portion of the world's surface. Yet such a world-wide monopoly would be in perfect consonance with Socialist principles.

The government of the United States, of Canada, and of other countries have within recent years parted, by way of gifts or sale, with many millions of acres, and still continue in this policy to-day. What

[1] See *Property and Progress*, by Mr. W. H. Mallock, p. 111.

possible moral right can these States have to expropriate those on whom they have but yesterday conferred a valid title?

The existing proprietors, by personal hard work and by the expenditure of carefully saved capital, have in most cases cultivated and developed land hitherto uncultivated. The Socialist nevertheless claims to deprive them of the fruit of their own labour and capital, and to usurp such land for himself.

In new countries the repulsive injustice in regard to the land, which Socialism would in practice inflict, must surely be patent to all whose eyes are not blinded by the lust of plunder. Yet in this country the injustice would be no less great.

The Socialists' attack upon the land is to a large extent a campaign of prejudice. The animus against landowners is historical. Mr. W. H. Mallock most effectively replies to the diatribes to which Socialists give vent regarding the enclosure of commons, the reduction in the land tax, and the alleged doubtful titles of some landlords.

These are the points on which Socialists, in dealing with the land question, invariably discourse. *The real point of contention is*, as Mr. Mallock enforces, not that certain landlords have acquired their estates unfairly, but *that it is unfair for any one to acquire any private estates at all.* It is as though, states Mr. Mallock, a preacher were to maintain that the wearing of all clothes was a sin, and in support of his contention were to adduce the fact that certain persons in London had not paid their tailors' bills.

The utmost, to quote again from Mr. Mallock,

which such charges as Mr. Hyndman and other Socialists dilate upon can do, even if clearly established, is *not* to constitute *but to aggravate* the offence. The charge is that *all* landowning is robbery; *not* that robbery in certain cases has been accompanied by violence.[1]

The whole of the Socialist contention in regard to the land affords a striking illustration of the fact that "justice," as interpreted by the Socialists, has a wholly novel signification.

In Mr. Belfort Bax's words, "It is, therefore, on this notion of justice that the crucial question turns in debates between the advocates of modern Socialism and of modern Individualism respectively."[2]

Unless Injustice is to be construed as Justice, the whole of the Socialist case respecting the land fails *in toto*.

[1] See *Property and Progress*, by Mr. W. H. Mallock, pp. 107 and 108.
[2] *The Ethics of Socialism*, p. 75.

XV

SOCIALISM AND AGRICULTURE

Importance of Agriculture

In his recently published volume, *The Socialist and the City*, Mr. Jowett, M.P., gives expression to an opinion of no small interest, seeing that it proceeds from a prominent Socialist: ". . . If we agree, as I think we must, that agriculture should be the most important industry in the State, then it is obvious that the restoration of agriculture to its normal position is one of the things necessary to the solution of the problem of unemployment."[1]

With Mr. Jowett's pronouncement in regard to the predominant importance of agriculture as an industry few will be prepared to quarrel. Notwithstanding the diminution in the numbers of those employed in agriculture, according to the census returns for 1901 in England and Wales, agriculture still for that year represented the industry in which the largest total number of persons were occupied, viz., 988,340.[2]

[1] *The Socialist and the City*, p. 79.
[2] See *The Fiscal Blue Book*, Cd. 1761 of 1903, p. 362.

The Socialist Policy as regards Agriculture

The Socialist policy in respect to agriculture is thus laid down by Mr. H. M. Hyndman: "We propose to organise labour on the land in co-operative farms by means of the Communes and County Councils under the control of the whole industrial community."[1]

In proof of the fact that the policy as defined in the above statement by so prominent a Socialist as Mr. Hyndman accurately represents the policy of the Socialist Party in regard to agriculture, it would be superfluous to quote further authority. That such is the case is beyond serious question.

In regard, therefore, to agriculture, there is once again a clear-cut issue between the advocates of Socialism and its opponents.

Defects in the Socialist Policy

The former propound a communal system of farming; the latter for the most part are equally firmly convinced that in this of all industries it is essential *not* to eradicate, but, on the contrary, to promote and extend the proprietary interest of the individual in the soil which he cultivates. The policy of Socialism tends directly to root out that most powerful of all incentives to the agriculturist, commonly yclept "the magic of property."

At the time when Arthur Young lived (died 1820), few persons, if any, can have possessed a more intimate knowledge of agricultural conditions then

[1] *The Single Tax* v. *Social Democracy*, p. 27 (Twentieth Century Press).

prevailing in England, Ireland, and France, than did that writer. In *Chambers's Encyclopædia* he is described as "one of the first to elevate agriculture to the dignity of a science." It is noteworthy, therefore, that so eminent an authority was wont to declare that "the magic of property turns sand to gold. . . . Give a man the secure possession of a bleak rock and he will turn it into a garden." [1]

France, Germany, Canada, the States, and various other parts of the civilised world go to prove conclusively the truth of this statement to-day.

In the opinion of the late Professor Lecky, "Nothing, indeed, in history or economics is more plain than that the strong stimulus of an *exclusive personal interest* can alone attract to land the labour and the capital that make it fully productive, and that the productiveness of the soil is one of the first conditions of the well-being of the whole community." [2]

Socialist writers and speakers not infrequently refer to the Roman latifundia, as evidence in support of the policy which they advocate in regard to agriculture. It is of importance, therefore, to note that Pliny the Elder in his *Historia Naturalis* records: "The ancients thought it of prime importance to limit the size of estates, as they deemed that it was better to have *a small acreage with better cultivation*; an opinion also held, I see, by Virgil. And if one will confess the truth, *the latifundia have been the ruin of Italy*, and are now also ruining the provinces." [3]

[1] Quoted by Mr. Jesse Collings in his *Land Reform*, p. 2. Published in 1906.

[2] *Democracy and Liberty*, Cabinet edition, vol. i. p. 212.

[3] Pliny, *Natural History*, Book XVIII., quoted by Mr. Jesse Collings in his *Land Reform*, p. 10.

Socialism and Agriculture

The following passage from the writings of Dr. Schäffle briefly sums up the principal points on which anti-Socialists join issue with the Socialist policy in regard to the land: "Popular collective production, as opposed to peasant proprietorship, is open to the very gravest doubts as to whether it would work more productively, and, by cheapening the necessities of life, more advantageously for the masses of the people, at the same time securing to each producer and his family the whole result of his labour. . . . The peasant with his family is proprietor and labourer in one person, and himself draws *the whole of the results of his labour: property does therefore secure the very thing which Socialism promises, but cannot safely guarantee.*" [1]

To say to the peasant, as Socialism in effect would do, your share in the soil is $\frac{1}{4,000,000}$ *indivisible* part of the United Kingdom, would, in practice, prove an incentive to labour scarcely, if at all, more potent than to remind the British bricklayer that he has at present the same proprietary interest in the National Picture Gallery in Trafalgar Square.

Of all industries, agriculture is the one to which Socialists have probably devoted the least serious attention.

Socialism, in so far as it has yet deigned to vouchsafe a constructive policy, has constructed its policy wholly from deductions relevant to the Factory System.

On its constructive side Socialism has hitherto practically ignored agriculture, vitally important

[1] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, pp. 276, 277.

though that industry must always continue to be. This fact of late years has been recognised by the German Social Democrats, who have attempted to remedy this important defect in their policy.

Soon after the Halle Congress of 1890, the Social Democratic Party issued a manifesto in which they wisely confessed that few Socialists knew anything about agricultural questions, and consequently invited information and discussion for the enlightenment of their Party respecting this most important industry.[1]

The Socialist when he exchanges the problems of the towns for that of agriculture, as a rule, is quickly in difficulties. To his thinking, land is land and one acre is as good as another. He entirely overlooks, also, the human equation. It frequently seems to be the Socialist's opinion that in the working of the land individual knowledge and training scarcely count at all.

The actual facts strongly militate against this shallow ill-informed optimism. The land agent to Earl Carrington, the present President of the Board of Agriculture, is an expert with many years' practical experience of small holdings, and was a witness before the Committee which reported on this subject in 1906. In his evidence Mr. H. M. Jonas laid noteworthy stress on the necessity of the qualifications and suitability of the agricultural tenant. He would, he said, let an allotment to any man, but he would only give a small holding to one who had proved his powers of cultivation.[2]

[1] See Mr. Rae's *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 44.

[2] See the Report of the Departmental Committee on Small Holdings in Great Britain, Cd. 3277 of 1906, p. 20.

The testimony of Earl Carrington's agent does not by any means stand alone. It is confirmed by every one who has a knowledge of this subject. The Committee themselves were of the same opinion. They expressly stated that "It by no means follows that those who are asking for small holdings are always men who are capable of doing justice to them; on the contrary, many of those who make these requests are known to be quite unfit."[1] Moreover, it is only certain kinds of land in certain situations which can be economically worked as a small holding.

It is not thought necessary here to quote further evidence in proof of the fact that agriculture is an industry which requires very considerable knowledge on the part of those who embark upon it, if success is to be the outcome. That such is most certainly to-day the case any agriculturist with experience will be prepared to testify.

Mr. Bernard Shaw's article in the *Fabian Essays* on the "Economic Basis of Socialism" affords an instance of the typical hazy manner in which Socialists approach the question of agriculture.

"The wise and patient workman" is described as striking his spade into the sand, "and with heavy toil can discover nothing but a poor quality of barley, some potatoes, and plentiful nettles, with a few dock-leaves to cure his stings." Possibly this picture represents Mr. Shaw's conception of "mixed farming"! The same "wise" workman is further portrayed as one who "never knows as he tugs at"

[1] See the Report of the Departmental Committee on Small Holdings, Cd. 3277 of 1906, p. 26.

Earth's "closed hand, whether it contains diamonds or flints, good red wheat or a few clayey and blighted cabbages."[1]

Truly, if the "wise" agriculturist is no better judge of the suitability of the soil in question, and is under the impression that "good red wheat" sows and manures itself, the date when England in the matter of bread-supplies will be entirely self-supporting, as Socialists so confidently predict it can be, appears somewhat remote.

England to become Independent of External Food-Supplies

Socialists not only profess by the introduction of communal farming to bring agriculture in Great Britain to a state of prosperity, but also to render this country in the matter of food-supplies *entirely self-supporting*. Before quoting authority for the above statement, it would be advisable in this connection to call attention to a fact which Socialists and others alike appear to be ignorant of, or, at all events, constantly disregard.

When persons refer, as is so constantly the case, to this country "*again* becoming self-supporting," they wholly ignore the enormous increase in population which has taken place in England since the date when this country ceased to be self-supporting.

This circumstance, of course, necessitates a vastly greater production of food-supplies of all kinds than was ever achieved by England or by the United Kingdom in the past.

[1] *Fabian Essays*, p. 3.

Socialism and Agriculture

The following passage from so authoritative an exponent of Socialism in this country as Mr. Robert Blatchford, the well-known editor of the *Clarion*, sufficiently indicates what is the Socialist contention in regard to the production by England of her food-supplies.

"The Manchester School will tell you," writes Mr. Blatchford, "that we cannot grow our own corn. That is not true. They will tell you that as foreigners can grow corn more cheaply than we can, and as we can make cotton goods more cheaply than they can, it is to the interest of both parties to exchange. I do not believe that any nation could sell corn more cheaply than we could produce it, and I am sure that even if it cost a little more to grow our corn than to buy it, yet it would be to our interest to grow it. . . . I know it has been said, and is said, that an English farmer owning his land cannot compete with foreign dealers; but I think that is doubtful, and I am sure that if the land were owned by the State, and farmed systematically by the best methods, we might grow our corn more cheaply than we could buy it. But suppose we could not. The logical result of the free-trade argument would be that British agriculture must perish. The case was very clearly put by Mr. Cobden in the House of Commons:—

> "'To buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest, what is the meaning of the maxim? It means that you take the article which you have in the greatest abundance, and with it obtain from others that of which they have most to spare; so giving to mankind the means of enjoying the fullest abundance of earth's goods.'

"Yes, it means that, but it means," continues Mr. Blatchford, "much more than that. However, let us reduce these fine phrases to figures. Suppose America can sell us wheat at 30s. a quarter, and suppose ours costs 32s. 6d. a quarter. That is a gain of $\frac{1}{15}$ in the cost of wheat. We get a loaf for 3d. instead of having to pay $3\frac{1}{4}$d.: *that is all the fine phrases mean.*"[1]

Mr. Blatchford's contention, it is sufficiently obvious, far transcends that of the most extreme Protectionist. The latter invariably recognises that it is *not* possible, in the matter of providing food-supplies for the population of the United Kingdom, to dispense with the assistance of other parts of the British Empire. Between these two contentions there is accordingly a vast gulf.

How do English Socialists propose to render this country independent of external sources? To such a question the answer is, briefly, by means of intensive cultivation.

Their authority for the assertion that the United Kingdom is capable of producing, unassisted, sufficient to meet not only the needs of her present population, but of a population double that size, is Prince Kropotkin. It is significant that the only authority whom the Socialists can prevail upon to shoulder this astounding dictum is not even an English agriculturist, but a foreign prince. Kropotkin wrote a book, *Fields, Factories, and Workshops*, and Mr. Keir Hardie, in his recent book *From Serfdom to Socialism*, quotes from it as follows:—

"(1) If the soil of the United Kingdom were

[1] *Merrie England*, pp. 32 and 33.

cultivated only as it was thirty-five years ago, 24,000,000 people instead of 17,000,000 could live on home-grown food, and that culture, while giving occupation to an additional 750,000 men, would give nearly 3,000,000 wealthy home customers to the British manufactures. (2) If the cultivable area in the United Kingdom were cultivated as the soil is cultivated on the average in Belgium, the United Kingdom would have food for at least 37,000,000 inhabitants; and it might export agricultural produce without ceasing to manufacture so as freely to supply all the needs of a wealthy population. And finally (3) if the population of this country came to be doubled, all that would be required for producing the food for 80,000,000 inhabitants would be to cultivate the soil as it is cultivated in the best farms of this country, in Lombardy, and in Flanders, and to utilise some meadows, which at present lie almost unproductive, in the same way as the neighbourhoods of the big cities in France are utilised for market gardening. All these are not fancy dreams but mere realities; nothing but modest conclusions from what we see round about us, without any allusion to the agriculture of the future."[1]

To the retort that such a prediction could never by any possibility be fulfilled in practice, Socialists in England are wont to respond that *The Times* reviewed Prince Kropotkin's book and stated that his scheme was thoroughly sound. *The Times* said nothing of the sort. In *Britain for the British* (p. 113) Mr. Blatchford quotes from *The Times* review, and we may be sure that he omits nothing therefrom

[1] *From Serfdom to Socialism*, p. 114.

that would help him to bolster up Kropotkin as an authority. All that the passage quoted amounts to is this: that there "is no reason why people should not read his book, which will certainly set them thinking, and may lead a few of them to try, by practical experiments, to lessen some of the acknowledged evils of the present industrial system."[1]

We here encounter one of the jejune inconsistencies to which Socialists habitually fall victims. The "land-grabber" is denounced in no measured terms by the Socialist for his rapacity, greed, and avariciousness. In the next breath the Socialist roundly asserts that much of the land which could in this country be advantageously cultivated is allowed by these same rapacious robbers of their own accord to remain unproductive.

To the Socialist contention that intensive cultivation can perform these feats, our reply is why, then, do not the Socialists give practical evidence of what they assert is possible?

Even were they to establish in this way the alleged unbounded possibilities of intensive cultivation, their case still would be incomplete. *A climate* so variable and proverbially fickle as this country possesses must, it is submitted, always supply *an invincible reason against the United Kingdom attempting to rely solely on her own resources for her food supplies.*

When Socialism can regulate the seasons such an argument will lose its force, not before.

Socialists generally have shared in the mistake committed by Henry George of ignoring the fact that subsistence depends on the productive capacity

[1] See *Britain for the British*, p. 113.

of land as well as of labour, and that, so far as land is concerned, this capacity is *not* indefinitely progressive.[1]

"The limit to subsistence," as Mr. Rae, with reason, asserts, "is *not* the productive capacity of labour, but the productive capacity of land."[2]

In the following passage Mr. Rae admirably enforces the same point:—

"Organisation and economy of labour are excellent things, but they cannot press from the udder more milk than it contains, or rear on the meadow more sheep than it will carry, or grow on a limited area available for cultivation more than a definite store of food."[3]

Further, experience goes to prove that concentration does not promote the success of intensive cultivation. To cite an example: Some few years ago various holdings situated in the Channel Islands, long associated with highly intensive cultivation, were consolidated. The small peasant-proprietors were in many cases bought out. The result has *not* been to produce from the consolidated holdings such satisfactory results as the peasant-proprietor generally achieved.

If such is the experience attaching to the extremely moderate-sized holdings (speaking relatively) produced by this consolidation, far less satisfactory would be the result if the whole of the agriculture of the United Kingdom were to become a State industry. The State officials would be wanting in any personal interest in the land, whilst the labourers

[1] See Mr. Rae's *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 468.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 481.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 482.

would be equally destitute of any such incentive as "the magic of property" supplies.

Moreover, it should be pointed out that there is no foundation for the assumption that the British farmer's ability to grow wheat is not equal to that of foreign farmers. The fact that the *average* product per acre on British soil far exceeds that of France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Denmark, Belgium, Russia, the United States, &c., sufficiently refutes any such contention. Further, in regard to the breeding of live-stock, the United Kingdom is able to compete with that of any other country in the world.

When Mr. Jowett, M.P., declares that "The experience of other countries, however, such as Denmark for instance, proves conclusively that land—no better than our own—can be profitably utilised under the new conditions, if the situation is thoughtfully faced with enterprise and determination,"[1] his concrete example merely goes to prove the advantage of co-operation and the subdivision of the soil. Denmark is a country in which the soil is greatly subdivided. As such it constitutes an argument *not* in favour of, but directly opposed to, the Socialist policy in respect of agriculture.

Socialism would tend directly *not* to promote, but on the contrary to powerfully restrict the progress of agriculture as a science. By its method of distribution Socialism would inevitably remove all incentive to the exercise of ability in this as in other industries.

The successful scientific agriculturist would, under the Socialist *régime*, receive no proportionate reward whatsoever. If distribution "according to needs"

[1] *The Socialist and the City*, p. 80.

be adopted, he might possibly even receive less than a very indifferent ploughman. Yet it cannot well be denied that discovery and invention have during the past two centuries played a most prominent part in developing husbandry, in improving the breed of live-stock, and in many other similar ways.

Various authorities of note could be quoted in proof of this statement. The following should, however, be sufficient for present purposes.

Professor Thorold Rogers, to whom as an economist Socialists so frequently appeal, emphatically asserted that the ability and the capital of the landed class were, during the eighteenth century, "the pioneers of agricultural progress."

As examples of this progress, Professor Rogers quotes the fact that the average weight of the fatted ox was raised from 400 to 1200 lbs., and the weight of the average fleece increased fourfold.[1]

The Marxian Doctrine regarding the Land

One of the most noteworthy of the Marxian doctrines was the theory of social revolution by historical necessity. Production on a large scale was, according to Karl Marx, inevitably superseding that on a small scale. The existing system was consequently rapidly speeding to a close. Nothing could check the climax which was inevitably approaching.

Mr. H. M. Hyndman, one of the most distinguished representatives of the Marxian school in England,

[1] Quoted by Mr. Mallock in *Labour and the Popular Welfare*, pp. 161 and 162.

for example, in his celebrated debate on the land question with the late Mr. Henry George, on July 2, 1889, asserted that ". . . The tendency of the times is towards production on a larger and larger scale, with larger and larger capital, alike in agriculture and in manufacture." [1]

The official statistics quoted in this chapter (see p. 490) go to prove conclusively that in this country the prediction of the Marxian school is, so far as agriculture is concerned, wholly opposed to the facts of the present day.

Dr. Schäffle has thus accurately defined the present tendency: ". . . Agriculture, unlike other industries, tends in the direction of small or moderately large concerns. The denser population becomes, the more do medium and small-sized holdings—with the aid of subsidiary collective machinery—ensure the necessary provision for the people." [2]

In an introduction to a recent reprint of this very debate with Mr. George, Mr. Hyndman himself admitted, as recently as July 1906, that "The great factory-farms in the United States have *not* played the part in American agriculture that was anticipated by Marx and his followers twenty years ago." [3]

Further, we are informed by Mr. John Spargo that: "A few years ago we witnessed the rise and rapid growth of the great bonanza farms in this country (*i.e.* the United States). . . . The end of the small

[1] *The Single Tax* v. *Social Democracy*, p. 8. (Twentieth Century Press.)
[2] *The Impossibility of Social Democracy*, translated by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, p. 70.
[3] *The Single Tax* v. *Social Democracy*, Introduction, p. 4. (Twentieth Century Press.)

farm was declared to be imminent, and it seemed for a while that concentration in agriculture would even outrun concentration in manufacture. This predicted absorption of the small farms by the larger, and the average increase of farm acreage, has *not*, however, been fulfilled to any great degree. An increase in the number of small farms, and a decrease in the average acreage, is shown in almost all the States. . . . Apparently, then, the Socialist theory of 'the big fish eat up the little ones' is *not* applicable to agriculture. On the contrary, it seems that the great wheat ranch cannot compete with the smaller farm."[1]

The Marxian doctrine has of late years been wholly repudiated by Herr F. E. Bernstein, formerly editor of the German *Social Demokrat* newspaper, and one of the most prominent leaders of the Social Democratic Party in Germany.

In a pamphlet, published in 1898, Herr Bernstein announced that when they turned to agriculture, they found that the great estates and the great farms were *not* swallowing up the small.[2]

It is somewhat surprising, therefore, to find that Mr. Thomas Kirkup asserts in the 1906 edition of his *History of Socialism*, as follows: "But the inevitable process of concentration of industrial operations, already referred to, is entirely against the continuance or restoration of the small producer, whether workman or peasant proprietor. Such efforts of continuance or restoration are reactionary: they are economically unsound and must fail. The economic

[1] *Socialism*, by Mr. John Spargo, pp. 108 and 109 (published in 1906).
[2] See Mr. Rae's *Contemporary Socialism*, 3rd edition, p. 518.

transformation must be sought in the application of the principle of association to the large industry."[1]

It is most certainly not the intention of the present writers to lend any support to the view that all is to-day well with the condition of British agriculture considered from every standpoint.

Statistics generally do not support any such conclusion.

Statistics respecting Agricultural Holdings

In this connection it might be advisable here to refer briefly to the proportion borne by small holdings to the total agricultural holdings of this country.

According to an official return of the Board of Agriculture issued in 1907, the number of agricultural holdings *in England alone* during the year 1906, exceeding 1 acre and not exceeding 5 acres, amounted to 80,917. The number during the same year in England alone exceeding 5 acres and not exceeding 50 acres, totalled 166,017. Contrasting the year 1906 with the year 1895, the tendency in England has been for agricultural holdings from 50 to 300 acres to increase in number. *During the same period the diminution in the number of the largest holdings, namely, those exceeding* 300 *acres, has in England been very marked,* thus directly negativing the Marxian theory. The same diminution has shown itself in Scotland and in Wales, but by no means to the same large extent that is to be met with in the case of England.[2]

[1] *History of Socialism*, 1906 edition, p. 358.
[2] See Cd. 3408 of 1907, p. 3.

Perhaps one of the main reasons for this may be found in the fact that the land-owning classes have now for the most part, as was stated by the Marquess of Lansdowne in a speech in the House of Lords on April 25, 1907, arrived at the conclusion "that the policy of consolidating holdings, a policy which has prevailed for so many years in this country, was a mistaken policy."

In the diminution of these larger holdings, however, there is little cause for congratulation from the standpoint of British agricultural prosperity, seeing that during the period under notice the total number of agricultural holdings of all sizes shows a decrease in England of nearly 9000. In Wales there is an increase, but in Scotland, again, there is a decrease. During the same period, 1895 to 1906, in Great Britain the number of the smaller holdings, both in the case of those varying from 1 to 5 acres, as well as in that of those from 5 to 50 acres, has also fallen; and of these two classes of holdings there is the largest proportionate diminution in that of from 1 to 5 acres. The largest holdings in Great Britain, *i.e.* those exceeding 300 acres, have during the period 1895 to 1906 largely decreased in numbers; whilst the moderate-sized holdings, *i.e.* those varying from 50 to 300 acres, have in Great Britain increased in number from 147,870 in 1895 to 150,881 in 1906.[1]

To summarise the fate of the land in Great Britain in these eleven years, viz., 1895 to 1906, not only has previously cultivated land in some cases gone entirely out of cultivation and become waste land,

[1] See Cd. 3408 of 1907, p. 3.

employing no labour and yielding no return, but during this period thousands of acres that were used for arable purposes have been laid down to grass, increasing further the enormous amount which in previous years has been laid down to permanent pasture. This change is, of necessity, accompanied by a reduction in the number of labourers employed, and is in itself a serious factor in the creation of urban unemployment and overcrowding.

In 1895 the total acreage of land in Great Britain under cultivation of corn crops amounted to 7,400,000, and by 1906 it had declined to 7,057,000, while during the same period permanent pasturage had increased from 16,610,563 in 1895 to 17,244,734 acres in 1906.[1]

Doubtless, as the result of the higher prices prevailing for wheat, &c., at the present time (December 1907), the acreage under corn crops in England may show some increase in the immediate future. Considerably more than this is, however, requisite to permanently improve the condition of British agriculture.

Socialism would Accentuate the Evils it Professes to Remedy

No such improvement would, however, accrue from the adoption of Socialism, with its attendant suppression of all individual incentive. This fact cannot be too clearly emphasised.

Of all forms of property land is that which is least

[1] See the Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom, and Agricultural Statistics for 1906, vol. xli., Part I., Cd. 3281 of 1906, pp. 22 and 23.

adapted, in order to obtain the best results, to centralised administration.

Countries such as Denmark to-day go conclusively to prove to how great an extent the extensive subdivision of the soil, coupled with a system of co-operation, can stimulate production.

The true line of deliverance lies, it is submitted, in co-operation unaccompanied by the destruction of private property which would necessarily result from the adoption of Socialism.

Co-operative agricultural associations confer on small proprietors all the advantages attaching to large farms, without at the same time destroying the intense zeal which invariably characterises the peasant or yeoman proprietor. Such associations enable the small owners not only to buy and sell on the same favourable terms as can the large farmers, but also keep them in closer touch with the ever-changing requirements of the market, and thus tend to direct their energies into the most profitable branches.

If, further, the small proprietor is to succeed in agriculture, it is essential that his land should not become heavily mortgaged at high rates of interest. If, for example, the peasant purchasers under the Irish Land Acts are to attain any permanent degree of success, a most careful watch will have to be kept on the proceedings of the gombeen-man, or the last state of the Irish peasant will be infinitely worse than the former. It is most important, therefore, to secure so far as possible that the legitimate borrowings of the small proprietor should be satisfied at the lowest possible rates of interest.

Mr. Jowett, M.P., himself admits that "the

agricultural problem in Great Britain" is affected more by "the insufficiency of capital employed by the cultivator," than "by the land-owning system."[1] An admission not without interest in view of the bitter denunciation regarding the latter with which Socialist public platforms invariably ring.

Mr. Cloudesley Brereton, in an article published in *The Fortnightly Review* for July 1907, indicates what is the method best suited to attain this object.

Banks of the Raffeisen type, states Mr. Brereton, are really institutions in co-operative banking. The system has met with immense success in assisting small farmers and peasant proprietors in Germany, Austria, and Italy. Despite the millions which have been lent in loans, many of the banks have suffered no loss whatsoever. In Germany alone large tracts of country which previously were in bondage to the usurers have, so states Mr. Brereton, been rescued from their clutches, and their populations, once the most poverty-stricken and unprogressive, have become well-to-do and the most go-ahead among German agriculturists. In Protectionist countries, writes Mr. Brereton, it is "dear money" which has been chiefly responsible for impoverishing the peasant proprietary classes.

Land Reclamation Schemes

Before dismissing the present subject some reference should be made to the costly and practically non-productive schemes regarding Land Reclamation

[1] *The Socialist and the City*, p. 80.

so constantly advocated by Socialists at the present time.

As, for example, on the reclamation from the sea of a few acres on the East coast of England, Socialists desire to expend a vast amount of labour and of capital.

The benefit to English agriculture if such proposals were successfully carried out would be practically nil, or, at all events, infinitesimal in the extreme. The same expenditure of labour and of capital would serve to develop an acreage running into several thousands, in, for example, Western Canada, or Australia. Soil admittedly some of the most productive in the world awaits in Canada only the application of labour and of capital, in order to produce wheat or other crops in abundance. To-day vast tracts of country forming part of the British Empire are within reach of London, at an expenditure of cost, time, and personal discomfort, for the most part less than a journey to Ireland necessitated a century ago. To the Socialist the over-seas dominions of the British Empire are *anathema*. "Socialists are in this respect eminently 'Little Englanders,'" to quote the phrase of Mr. Belfort Bax and Mr. Quelch.[1]

Consequently English Socialism to-day is habitually found to strenuously oppose all British emigration, even though directed merely to some other portion of the Empire. To the Socialist the maxim "Blood is thicker than water" is in practice destitute of meaning.

[1] *A New Catechism of Socialism*, p. 32. (The Twentieth Century Press.)

XVI

SOCIALISM AND THE RAILWAYS AND MINES

SOCIALISM AND THE RAILWAYS

THE Social Democratic Party, the Independent Labour Party, and the Fabian Society one and all advocate the nationalisation of the railways. This policy, so far as Socialists are concerned, represents only a step. *Between nationalisation and socialisation there is a wide gulf.* Nationalisation would merely replace the present ownership and control by a Government Department; the nature of the workers' service would remain as at present. Instead of receiving wages from the companies' officials, the employees would obtain their pay from Government officials. There would still be competition as between man and man, and promotion and pay according to merit.

If the railways were *socialised*, the industry would be merged in the general undertakings of the State. Individual competition would be entirely tabooed, and some equality of payment would be aimed at, irrespective of personal merit and deserving, and solely determined by the "needs" of individuals. Socialists make no secret of the fact that

nationalisation is to be merely the half-way house on the road to socialisation. It, therefore, behoves those who might not demur at the former, but who would not tolerate the latter, to oppose both these proposals. It should also be realised that the railways are *merely the first* objective. "Every form of transit—tramways, canals, railways, or ships—comes rightly and inevitably within the purview of a Labour policy."[1]

The Cost of the Railways of the United Kingdom, &c.

Exclusive of the capital invested in the Underground Electric Railways Company of London, Limited, the total paid-up capital invested in the railways of the United Kingdom, as officially given for the year 1906, was 1286.9 million pounds, of which 195.3 million pounds represented nominal additions on the consolidation, conversion, and division of stocks. The Socialist case is that this latter figure should be deducted, and while there is much that can be urged for its retention, we do not propose to raise that point at the present. For the purpose of our argument we will, for the moment, concede that deduction, and we then have a total of 1091.6 million pounds, which represents the capital which the public have invested in the railways of the United Kingdom.[2]

We may take it for granted that the Social Democratic Party in this country would frankly confiscate

[1] See Fabian Tract, No. 127, p. 13.
[2] See Cd. 3705 of 1907, p. vi.; see also p. xxvi.

this property without a farthing of compensation. The main feature of their "immediate" financial policy is the Repudiation of the National Debt. The railway investors may expect similar treatment.

From the Independent Labour Party we, of course, expect opportunism. They would pay, but the amount would be the barest and unfairest minimum. Above all, they would do everything possible to depreciate the value of the stock, &c., before they bought it. As Mr. W. C. Anderson said at the Annual Conference, held at Derby in April 1907: "If the railwaymen's movement were helped, and the Labour Party in Parliament used every opportunity, a still greater depreciation of railway stock would result, and easier terms of acquisition could be made when the State came to deal with the matter."[1]

The Fabian Society's financial scheme is thus stated in Fabian Tract, No. 127, pp. 13 and 14: "In taking over the railways the nation should pay no respect either to the fancy or to the stock values, but only to the proportion to which the shareholders are honestly entitled." A suggestion follows (see p. 14) that twenty-five years' purchase, calculated on the earnings of the three previous years, may be found to be an "equitable basis." One may well ask what is to happen in those cases where there are at the time being no net earnings at all, but in which, none the less, the stock or shares are by no means valueless owing to future prospects, &c.

[1] See Report of Conference, p. 51.

Declining Dividends

"The following statement,"[1] to quote the Official Railway Returns of the United Kingdom for 1906, "compares the average proportion of net earnings to capital in each quinquennial period from 1871–75 to 1901–5:—

Years.	Proportion of Total Net Earnings to Capital.
	Per Cent.
Average of 1871–75	4.56
„ 1876–80	4.29
„ 1881–85	4.22
„ 1886–90	4.07
„ 1891–95	3.80
„ 1896–1900	3.64
„ 1901–05	3.38"

It might have been thought that the meagreness of this return upon capital would have satisfied the Socialists that railway capital obtains no inequitable return for its outlay, more especially if regard be had to the undoubted risks which attached at the commencement to railway investment. The Socialists contest the accuracy of this return, however, on the ground that the capital on which this dividend is based is made up not only of paid-up capital, but also of the 195.3 million pounds which they call "watered capital." The utter unsoundness of this contention is exposed by the express statement in the Blue Book, above referred to (p. xvii.), that the general tendency to decline only "arises, *in part*,

[1] See Cd. 3705 of 1907, p. xvii.

from nominal additions to capital." (The italics are ours.)

In other words, were we to assume that this nominal capital was entitled to no dividend at all (a contention which could *not* be sustained), and were we to deduct it, none the less the earnings would yield a reduced dividend as compared with former years on the capital *minus* the nominal additions.

In view of the Fabian proposal that the railways should be "purchased" on a basis of twenty-five times the average of the dividends for the last three years, the official table[1] on the opposite page will be interesting.

It will be seen from the table that a quarter of the ordinary capital invested in railways returned not more than 2 per cent. in 1906, and more than one-half thereof not above 3 per cent. It would surely, then, be a gross hardship on those who are the holders of this £67,475,939 ordinary stock, and who at the present time are receiving *no* dividend whatsoever, to be deprived of their investments on a basis which would afford them no compensation whatsoever. This, notwithstanding the fact that most, if not all, of this stock possesses to-day a substantial market value, notwithstanding that the market value is, in most cases, very considerably less than the par value.

There is one financial item in regard to the railways as to which the Socialist maintains a stony silence. No mention is ever made by him of the fact that a very considerable proportion of

[1] Extracted from Cd. 3705 of 1907, p. xvii.

"*The following Statement shows the Amounts of each Description of Capital classed according to the Rates of Dividend or Interest paid in* 1906.

Rates of Dividend or Interest.	Ordinary.		Preferential.		Guaranteed.		Loans and Debenture Stock.	
	Amount of Capital.	Per Cent. of Total.	Amount of Capital.	Per Cent. of Total.	Amount of Capital.	Per Cent. of Total.	Amount of Capital.	Per Cent. of Total.
	£		£		£		£	
Nil	67,475,939	13.9	20,314,199	6.0	50,859	0.0	1,132,442	0.3
Not above 1 per cent. . .	33,461,653	6.9	2,535,970	0.8	...	...	777,766	0.2
Above 1 and not above 2 per cent.	24,523,411	5.0	66,000	0.0	1,351,180	1.1	80,647	0.0
,, 2 ,, 3 ,,	128,179,213	26.3	101,474,244	30.1	23,226,260	19.1	185,851,602	54.4
,, 3 ,, 4 ,,	60,786,542	12.5	160,383,876	47.6	58,107,027	47.7	108,287,150	31.7
,, 4 ,, 5 ,,	32,404,745	6.7	50,036,011	14.9	36,444,935	29.9	43,994,342	12.9
,, 5 ,, 6 ,,	57,977,606	11.9	1,863,814	0.6	2,608,200	2.2	1,569,404	0.5
,, 6 ,, 7 ,,	79,496,094	16.3	...	...	...	...	...	...
,, 7 ,, 8 ,,	1,354,400	0.3	...	...	2,000	...	5,400	0.0
,, 8 ,, 9 ,,	225,000	0.0	...	...	...	...	...	...
,, 9 ,, 10 ,,	835,410	0.2	...	...	...	...	...	...
Total . .	486,720,013	100.0	336,674,114	100.0	121,790,461	100.0	341,698,753	100.0"

the rates and taxes of the United Kingdom are provided out of the *gross* earnings of the railway companies.

To how great an extent this is the case is proved by the following official table:—

"The amounts of 'Rates and Taxes,'" state the Railway Returns[1] of the United Kingdom for 1906, "paid by the railway companies in each year since 1897, have been as follows:—

Year.	Total Amount of Rates and Taxes.	Increase compared with Previous Year.
	£	£
1897	3,294,000	...
1898	3,425,000	131,000
1899	3,582,000	157,000
1900	3,757,000	175,000
1901	3,980,000	223,000
1902	4,228,000	248,000
1903	4,493,000	265,000
1904	4,736,000	243,000
1905	4,933,000	197,000
1906	4,965,000	32,000

"There has thus been in the nine years a total increase of £1,671,000 in this item. As compared with the 1897 total, the sum paid by the railway companies under the head of Rates and Taxes in 1906 shows an advance of about 51 per cent."

[1] Extracted from Cd. 3705 of 1907, p. xiii.

Popular Myths as to Railways

Every effort is being made by the Socialists and their allies to represent the railways as being undertakings run in the interests of the great capitalists, who are supposed to derive in some subtle way or another a return vastly in excess of the income which the Government officially examines and certifies. Thus, from *The Reformer's Year-book* for 1908, we take the following astounding table (see page 136): —

"*Receipts and Expenditure.*

"The following figures are from the complete returns for 1905:—

Length of Line.	Total Receipts.	Average Receipts.		Working Expenses.	Net Receipts.[1]	Percentage of Expenses to Gross Receipts.
		Per Train Mile.	Per Mile of Line.			
Miles. 22,847	£ 113,531,000	£ 62.93	£ 4,601	£ 70,064,663	£ 43,466,356	62

"[1] Distributed in interest to bankers and debenture-holders and dividends to ordinary, preferential, and guarantee share-holders."

In this table the figures under the head of "Average Receipts per Train Mile" are wrong. They are stated as being 240 *times greater than they actually are.* Instead of being £62.93 per train mile, they are merely as many pence. The receipts for every mile run are, according to the official returns, *less than* 5s. 3d. *instead of being rather more than* £62, as *The*

Reformers' Year-book announces. It will be seen, too, on reference to the Blue Book above quoted, that the receipts per train mile from passenger and goods traffic combined have fallen from 62.93d. in 1905 to 62.73d in 1906.[1] The increase of receipts in this respect of late years is due solely to the fact that, owing to the great increase in wages and other outgoings, the railways of the United Kingdom have had to strain every nerve to effect economies in respect of train mileage, &c.

One of the charges which Socialists repeatedly make against the railways is that undue preferential rates are given to foreign and colonial produce as against the home producer. This accusation has been craftily made by the professedly International Socialist, with a view to the enlisting of the support of manufacturers and others. Unfortunately for the Socialists a Departmental Committee, appointed by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, inquired most fully into the matter. The Committee was presided over by the Earl of Jersey, and issued its Report (Cd. 2959 of 1906) in April 1906. A large number of witnesses were examined, and specific allegations were most carefully inquired into and considered.

For detailed information reference must be made to the Report itself; but the following extract from the "Conclusion" of the Majority Report[2] will answer the point at issue. "The question of preferences has been discussed on pages 11 and 12, and

[1] See p. xliii. Cd. 3705 of 1907.

[2] See p. 36, Cd. 2959 of 1906. The Majority Report, it should be noted, was signed by no less than six out of the seven members of the Committee who reported.

the conclusion at which the Committee have arrived is that the evidence tendered has failed to show that the railway companies are giving undue preferential treatment to foreign and colonial produce as compared with home produce, contrary to the intention and effect of existing legislation."

We may leave this branch of the subject with the following extract from a paper on the Nationalisation of the Railways read by Mr. Dixon H. Davies at Nottingham on January 16, 1907 :—

"The cry which reaches the politician is that the companies are using their power as monopolists to oppress the trader. This generally involves a double pretence ; first, the party complaining is not the public, but an unsuccessful trader masquerading in the clothes of the public ; secondly, what is complained of is not the action of the company as a monopolist, but the reverse—that is to say, its competitive activity. Take the case of the complaint that the South-Western Company were carrying American meat from Southampton to London at lower rates than home-fed beef. When the case reached the Commissioners' Court, that tribunal found that the complainants, though nominally an association of traders, were in fact one of the London Dock Companies, who were suffering because the land carriage of the railway company was proving itself more efficient than the sea carriage up the Channel, and thus diverting, by its competitive superiority, the traffic from the longer sea route to the disadvantage of no human being except the dock proprietors."

Another cry is that the railways have deliberately strangled the canals with the intention of forming

a strict monopoly as carriers. The latest Board of Trade returns for canals were issued in 1898. From these it appears that out of a mileage of 3116 miles in England and Wales, the railways only own 959 miles. (See *Hazell's Annual*, 1908, p. 89.)

The truth is, that under present trading requirements the canals can seldom compete with the railways. Quick delivery is in most instances the essential of to-day; and it is only in a country in which the State has failed to give an efficient railway supply that canals play a dominating part. Mr. Dixon H. Davies, in the paper above referred to, makes the statement: "Since 1875 the traffic per mile in Germany has increased from 410,000 tons to 740,000 only on the railways, while the corresponding increase on the waterways has been from 290,000 tons per mile to 1,150,000." The delays of water traffic and the necessity for having a full cargo are instances of why railways—properly controlled—are more efficient than canals. The railways undoubtedly are cutting out many of the canals, but this is solely due to the immensely greater advantages which the railways offer.

Socialists, and the ignorant, prate of "monopoly," and give their audiences to understand that the railways of this country fix their own rates. This is untrue, for the reason that the maximum rates have been determined by Parliament; and, as a matter of fact, *fully* 60 *per cent. of the merchandise traffic in Great Britain is carried at lower rates than the "class rates."* The maximum rates permitted are contained in various Acts passed by Parliament in the sessions of 1891 and 1892. The desire to

obtain business under competition is alone responsible for the fact that the railways of Great Britain are willing to carry 60 per cent. of their merchandise at lower rates than those which they can legally charge.

A frequent effort is made to compare British rates adversely with those obtaining in Continental countries, where the railways are State-owned. We have had the opportunity of personally discussing this point with several of the most prominent railway general managers in this country. They one and all challenge comparison on the heads of (1) Quantities carried; (2) form of baggage; (3) length of haulage. They further point out that the services rendered by British railway companies are widely different from those undertaken by the railways which are generally compared with them. British railways collect, warehouse, carry, warehouse again, and deliver goods. In other countries these services are usually undertaken by distinct agencies, which make a separate charge for such services.

Thus when the Socialists compare British railway rates with German rates, for instance, they are merely comparing the German rate for carriage alone, with the British charge for collection, warehousing, carriage, warehousing, and delivery. In other words, they are not comparing like with like. Full information on these points may be found in *German versus British Railways*, by Mr. Edwin A. Pratt, and *State Railways*, by the same writer.

There is one point of comparison which the Socialists are careful at all times to avoid, and that is in swiftness of despatch. In this country the railways

are as expeditious in the delivery of goods as is the Post Office. Goods received in London up to 6 P.M. are delivered 200 miles away by 10 A.M. the next day. Such facilities are *not* offered by State railways, and, *unless* special rates are paid, the transport service is very slow.

A great deal is said and written in support of a demand for "equal mileage rates" by advocates who claim that it is unjust if the railways do not charge an equal rate per mile irrespective of the cost of service or the distance covered. It will be realised, however, that some lines have involved a lesser expenditure in the making, &c.; while others have necessitated an infinitely greater sum in construction, and are more costly in the working. The champions of "equal mileage" brush aside all considerations of this kind, and seek to obtain the same rates for local as for through traffic, and also the same charges proportionately for small quantities as that which a company is able to charge for large quantities. A moment's inquiry will convince any practical man that this demand is an impossible one.

On the Socialist platforms the appeal for Nationalisation takes the form of a grotesque exaggeration of the profits earned. With this point, however, we have already dealt. The next step with the Socialist is to state a fanciful mortality figure, and then to denounce "the capitalistic system" for withholding automatic couplings. The argument of the Socialist orator is to the effect that the lives of the workers are cheaper than the cost of the introduction of automatic couplings. The following figures, which have been furnished by the general manager of one

of our greatest railways, prove that the mortality in the United States of America (where automatic couplings have been adopted) is far greater than in this country under present conditions.

Railway Accidents in U.S.A. and in the United Kingdom

Number of employees killed or injured *whilst coupling or uncoupling vehicles* on the railways *in the United States of America :—*

Year.	Killed.	Injured.
1901	Not available	Not available
1902	143	2113
1903	253	2788
1904	278	3441
1905	243	3110
1906	Not available	Not available

Number of employees killed or injured *whilst coupling or uncoupling vehicles* on the railways *in the United Kingdom :—*

Year.	Killed.	Injured.
1901	14	571
1902	15	501
1903	23	506
1904	10	542
1905	12	523
1906	9	572

In order that the above comparison should be fair, it must be remembered that there are rather

more than twice the number of men employed in the United States of America than there are in this country. If, however, we divide the number of American "injured" by 3, and not by 2, we still find that they are nearly twice as numerous as in the United Kingdom. And the proportion is with respect to the "killed," after dividing by 3 in the case of the U.S.A., *more than six times the total "killed" in the United Kingdom* for the year 1905, which is the latest year in each case for which comparative statistics for both these countries are available.

The Objections to Nationalisation

Nationalisation would militate against efficiency. The chief characteristic of railways which are commercially conducted is to be found in those commercial concessions to customers by which trade is fostered and encouraged. Such concessions take the form of quotations which are lower than the "class rates," and they are made with the aim of "making" trade, or with that of winning or holding existing traffic under competition. Commercial concessions appear in yet other forms; for instance, accelerated delivery, and special collecting, warehousing, and delivery facilities. On these latter heads the British railways to-day challenge comparison with any State railways in the world.

Similarly with respect to passenger traffic, workmen's fares, and to third-class season-ticket rates, with quick travel, our British lines are unequalled. Competition and the necessity of doing the best for customers if the concern is to succeed have

produced these results. The positions of officials are only safe if their work be successful; and that success is measured by commercial standards. In State railways there are many who have been jobbed into their places for political reasons. With private railways if a man be not worth his position, he goes. There is no waste and no leakage in this respect.

The following amazing passage, which we take from *The Reformer's Year-book* (p. 138), is characteristic of the groundless charges which are so frequently made:—

"The system of British railway rates is enigmatic even to the companies themselves. There are some 200 million separate rates, and large armies of clerks are kept doing little else than fight the traders over the rates and rectify the errors in cases where they are compelled. Every commission and committee on railways and on trade depression has had before it volumes of evidence as to the throttling of trade by exorbitant railway rates."

We rejoice to acknowledge that it is quite true that on the British railways there are some millions of rates. There may be more than 200,000,000 of them, and we hope that there will be more still. And what do these rates prove if it be not the splendid elasticity of the commercial machine? Remember that *none of them are higher than what Parliament has fixed, and* 60 *per cent. of them on an average are lower.* It is by means of this variation in rates that trade is possible, seeing that as a result of judicious differentiation geographical advantages are neutralised in the interests of the less favourably situated. Remove these varying rates, and population

in certain areas would be intensified and industry in remoter centres would be devastated. Is that the Socialist policy?

The allegation that "large armies of clerks are kept doing little else than fight the traders over the rates" is simply untrue; and the same must be written of the assertion, "Every commission and committee on railways and on trade depression has had before it volumes of evidence as to the throttling of trade by exorbitant railway rates."

The facts with regard to this matter have been stated by Mr. Pratt in *German versus British Railways* (p. 63) as follows:—

"Finally, in regard to British railway rates in general, I would point out that the present position thereof is the result of legislation which has followed in the wake of Royal Commissions and of protracted inquiry by a joint committee of both Houses of Parliament.

"Section 31 of the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888, provides that if any trader is of opinion that a railway company is treating him unfairly, or in an oppressive or unreasonable manner in any respect, he may complain to the Board of Trade. Yet, notwithstanding all that has been said and written in recent years against railways, *attention is again drawn, in the ninth report by the Board of Trade of proceedings under this section, to the continued 'marked falling off in the number of complaints against the railway companies.'* The total number of all kinds for the two years 1904 and 1905 was only 146, not a few of which were groundless and not proceeded with.

"Here, be it remembered, there is no suggestion

of instituting costly proceedings before the Railway and Canal Commission. It is a matter simply of addressing a complaint to the Board of Trade ; and yet the number of traders making such complaint is insignificant in the extreme, compared with the total of those who have dealings with the railways."

Just as an "equal mileage," or any other iron and inflexible system of handling traffic would throttle trade, so do these elastic varying rates in practice assist traders. The principle upon which our railways act has been ably summarised by Mr. Ross in his work *British Railways* (p. 195): "A railway charges less on cheap than it does on valuable goods, because the former cannot bear more, and would not be sent for carriage at all if high rates were put upon them. It reduces its rates, apart from competition, if it has reason to believe that they are higher than the goods can bear, and that a reduction will lead to an expansion of the volume of traffic without a proportionate increase in the cost of handling it. If it has the longer of two competitive routes, it reduces its rates to the level of those charged on the shorter route, because its traffic will not bear higher charges ; and if it has to meet the competition of sea-carriage, it modifies its charges accordingly, because its traffic with a cheaper, though less speedy and less sure, means of transportation available, will not bear the normal rates and will be in great part lost by any attempt to impose them."

The railways, then, make such charges as the traffic will bear within the limit imposed upon them by Parliament. The State could do no better. With the companies there is, however, a personal

responsibility and a constant incentive to meet trading exigencies. Would State officials in these respects be equally solicitous? The railways by thoughtful concessions "make" trade and foster it, and we find that the Socialists denounce the very means by which this is done. We submit that in view of the countless varying conditions and interests of trade the greater the elasticity the better for the industry of the country. The State would grant no elasticity at all, except probably in the shape of concessions to political supporters—special rates for votes.

Are the railways to be run commercially, or are they to be conducted on Mr. Bernard Shaw's notorious system of "invisible profits"?

If instead of eager, zealous managers, who under the spur of competition never miss a chance of fostering their traffic or of attracting fresh business, we are to have the standardised, easy-going official, is it credible that the revenue will be maintained? Is it not certain, too, that the expenditure will be enormously increased? The doctrine that the State need make no profit is only sound if it be true that the people need no food. Government officials are notoriously averse to innovations. In railway work it is, however, essential that progress should be maintained, and one may well wonder how many of the splendid improvements which have been made in the railways in recent years would have accrued to this country had private enterprise and competition and commercial considerations not been the prevailing factors.

In no way do Socialists "beg the question" more at variance with the facts than when they claim that

the State-owned railways of the world are models which the United Kingdom should follow. Those who desire details on this head should refer to Mr. Pratt's works, of which mention has already been made. They will find that the real truth is that State railways give a maximum of inefficiency with a minimum of satisfaction to the general public. In this connection it would perhaps be well to quote the following extract from the paper by Mr. Dixon H. Davies, read at Nottingham on January 16, 1907, to which we have already referred:—

"The story of the rates upon the nationalised railways of Germany is shortly this:—

"The Government started out in 1871 with the same excellent intentions that are evidently influencing the mind of our own President of the Board of Trade to-day. That is to say, to provide a remedy for commercial inequalities by establishing 'natural rates.' Every ton of goods of whatever character was to pay a rate made up of two parts—(1) A fixed charge for terminals, and (2) An equal charge per mile. The effect was disastrous. The cheaper commodities could not stand the rates. There was an universal outcry; so in 1877, to save industrial disaster, as well as to pacify the public, the German Government threw over their 'natural rates,' and adopted a 'reform tariff,' being a retrogression to the system of classification with varying rates per mile. But still short-distance traffic was strangled, and the traders cried out. Then followed the cutting of a bit off the terminal, and the sticking of it on to the mileage charge. This injured those interested in the through traffic, and again there was a public

agitation, whereupon the Government was driven into establishing an elaborate series of special export and other rates called a 'preferential tariff.' Even this failed to satisfy the public, and various traders continued to clamour for consideration for their particular industry. Once again the Government were driven into originating special rates much the same as the special rates of the English railways; and it appears from official records that to-day only 20 per cent. of the total traffic is handled on the 'reform tariff,' 63 per cent. on the 'preferential tariff,' and 17 per cent. under the 'special rates.'

"The German Government started with the intention of providing a simple and equable tariff. It has had to abandon that lofty aspiration, just as English railways are forced to depart from uniformity in conceding special rates, without which certain traffic could not be brought into existence, so that the German Government has in fact followed in the steps of British and American practice. The difference is that in Germany a concession cannot be secured except by the exertion of public agitation, and in some cases unpatriotic pressure, on the Ministry, whereas in England rates are arrived at by amicable negotiations in the general manager's office, subject to revision by the rare resort of proceedings before the Railway and Canal Commission."

The Political Danger of Railway Nationalisation

Apart from great railway centres in England, such as Derby, York, and Darlington, there are numerous

constituencies in which the railway vote decides an election. The gravity of this fact is evident when we realise that in all countries where the railways are State-owned the workers seek to use their votes as a lever to obtain benefits for themselves at the expense of the rest of the community. In Belgium there is unceasing trouble of this nature, and the employees are tireless in agitating about real or alleged grievances. In Italy, Mr. Pratt records that discipline has disappeared, and the railway servants intimidate the Minister of Railways.

The Rome correspondent of *The Morning Post*, under date January 22, 1908, in referring to the report of the Italian Government on the railways for 1907, states that "one cause of the comparatively unremunerative character" of the State-owned railways in Italy is "the issue of free, or partially free, tickets to an enormous number of persons."[1] This is but another of the many evils which political pressure in connection with State-owned railways produces.

The position in Australia as regards the State railway employees is indicated by the following quotation from *The Australasian* of May 9, 1903: "The real question is, whether the Government responsible to Parliament is to rule, or whether the railway men are to be supreme and dictate their own terms." Similar evidence may be found in the case of other countries. Control of railways by the State has resulted in jobbery in the appointments, agitation from the employees, and in cases in cowardly concessions to individuals at the expense of the rest of the community.

[1] *The Morning Post*, January 24, 1908.

Indeed, for good reasons, the question as to whether employees on State railways can safely be entrusted with the vote is gravely claiming attention. At the Derby Conference of the Independent Labour Party, held on April 2, 1907, Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P., referred to this subject. He, on that occasion, pointed out that in the Transvaal, and in the Australasian colonies, railway employees had been placed under varying electoral restrictions. He concluded with the frank announcement that "When the nationalisation of the railways became a serious matter, as it would do, probably this question of citizenship would be required to be fought out, and they, of course, would have no opinion about every man retaining the whole of his rights." [1]

One further aspect of nationalisation here merits attention. Experience has shown that the policy adopted in some of the countries where railways are State-owned is to increase charges, so as to form a fund which may be administered apart from the control of Parliament. Mr. Dixon H. Davies, commenting upon this matter, states in his paper of January 16, 1907, as follows:—

"Still another merit claimed by some is that national railways contribute to the revenue of the State. It is exceedingly doubtful whether they could be made to do so in England, for the reason that the profit of a public undertaking, whether it be a State railway or a municipal gas works, is not really a profit but a tax. As it is a principle of this country that people should be equally taxed according to their means, it is not likely that the men of business,

[1] See Report of the Conference, p. 52.

who furnish the principal traffic to the railways, would consent to have conveyance charges maintained against them for the sake of relieving the burden of the tax-payer at large. Again, revenue derived indirectly, in this manner, relieves the Government from the check of the purse-strings, which it is the function of the House of Commons to exert upon them. If our Ministers had, like those of Prussia, a source of revenue equivalent to half the national expenditure which did not require to be voted in Committee of Ways and Means, the power of the House of Commons would be a very different thing from what it is to-day."

Surely the menace which such a fund would offer to the purity of public life could not be easily exaggerated on the part of all who value and prize good government.

SOCIALISM AND THE MINES

Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P., in giving evidence before the Royal Commission on Mining Royalties, said that he would allow no compensation, "on the general ground that no one has created minerals; that they do not belong to any person in particular, but to the people as a whole;" he would, however, make an exception "where widows and children were dependent on royalties for their incomes."[1]

In spite of this unequivocal declaration, we hear but little on the subject of mines from the Socialists. The truth is that the evidence given before the Royal Commission on Mining Royalties, which reported in

[1] See Cd. 6980 of 1893, p. 47.

1893, killed the cry. All who are interested in this subject would do well to refer to that source for their information. The Report is in truth a very storehouse of valuable instruction.

Royalties, like ground-rents, are open to the attack of all who do not possess them, and who fail to realise that they are forms of investment undistinguishable in their attributes from other forms of property. If ground-rents and royalties are indefensible, indefensible also is the ownership of private property in all other forms. When fortunes have been spent in boring and sinking shafts, and in reaching a seam, perhaps hundreds of feet below the surface, it is absurd to sweep aside the claims of the private enterprise which has rendered such minerals available, and to say "that no one has created minerals; that they do not belong to any person in particular."

As the Report itself proceeds to state: "A vast capital, applied with remarkable skill and energy, has for many years been engaged in their development" (*i.e.* the coal and iron deposits of the United Kingdom) "and in that of other minerals, giving employment to more than half a million persons, to whom forty-three millions sterling is estimated to have been paid in wages in the year 1890."[1]

And this is after all only half the story. When the Socialists turn, as they always do, to the most successful undertakings, and declaim against the reward of capital and enterprise and skill, they invariably omit to mention, not merely those ventures which barely pay their way, but also the countless

[1] Cd. 6980 of 1893, p. 1.

failures over which millions have been lost in connection with mines, &c.

Astounding statements are made by Socialists and others as to the amount of the royalties on coal. How greatly exaggerated these are is proved by a table on page 5 of the Report, which shows that *the average royalty upon coal in Great Britain was less than* $5\frac{1}{2}$*d. per ton.*

Another point upon which Socialists frequently insist is that because of these royalties mines are often shut down in times of depression. This assertion is on the face of it unlikely, and the answer is recorded on page 14 of the Report of the Royal Commission.

Here the Commissioners state in their final report: "Mr. R. Young, whom we examined as the representative of the Northumberland miners, said truly that 'lessors generally find it to their advantage to reduce royalties when they find that a reduction is absolutely necessary for the continued working of the mines.'" And naturally so. Half a royalty is surely better than no royalty at all.

The Utility of Royalties

The Socialists were dismayed by the evidence given before the Commission and partly contained in the Report, proving that royalties actually were essential to the continued employment of labour in many mines. As Mr. Forster Brown stated in his evidence, "Mines are, in the nature of things, variable; you cannot take even two mines as being alike, and royalties help to equalise the circumstances,

whether the circumstances arise from one cause or from another." [1]

This means, of course, that the royalty is a floating margin payable in one form or another on all mines. Under adverse conditions it is reduced, and thus an unfavourably conditioned mine is still able to compete with other mines which pay the full royalty.

On p. 39 of the same Report reasons are given for the conclusion arrived at that the reduction, or indeed abolition, of royalties would *not* benefit the consumer, and for this technical argument, owing to reasons of space, we must refer the reader to the original source.

Amongst the conclusions of this Royal Commission were :—

"II. We are of opinion that the system of royalties has *not* interfered with the general development of the mineral resources of the United Kingdom, or with the export trade in coal with foreign countries.

"III. We do *not* consider that the 'terms and conditions under which these payments are made' are, generally speaking, such as to require interference by legislation. . . ." [2]

These conclusions, it should be recollected, were arrived at by the members of the Royal Commission *unanimously*.

In concluding our reference to this Report, it should be mentioned that this Royal Commission was in its constitution an exceptionally strong one, and numbered no less than twenty commissioners. Among these, it should be noted, were such well-known and deservedly influential leaders of "Labour"

[1] Quoted on p. 37 of the Report, Cd. 6980 of 1893.
[2] P. 79 of the Report.

as the Right Hon. Thomas Burt, M.P., and Mr. W. Abraham, M.P., President of the South Wales Miners' Federation.

In reference to this subject of mining royalties, the Right Hon. H. H. Asquith, M.P., the then Home Secretary, in replying to a motion by Mr. S. Woods, M.P., stated in the House of Commons on April 6, 1894, that this subject "had undergone a long and laborious investigation by a particularly able Commission, composed with the utmost impartiality, and it was now proposed to reverse their unanimous decision. The rents and way-leaves amounted to an annual sum of about £5,000,000, and, if the State was to acquire them, it must acquire the mines and minerals, open and unopened, throughout Great Britain and Ireland. This would amount, in the opinion of the best and most sober-minded authorities, to a capital expenditure of £150,000,000. *How would the State recoup itself? No case whatever had been made out for the proposed change.* The Government, therefore, asked the House to negative the motion."

Those who talk light-heartedly of the nationalisation of the mines of the United Kingdom would do well to realise how stupendous the undertaking is which they propose that the Government should take over.

According to the official report for the year 1906, "the total output of minerals at the mines under the Coal Mines Act was 265,204,716 tons, of which 251,050,809 were coal, 2,971,173 fireclay, 8,209,880 ironstone, 2,546,113 oil-shale, and 426,741 sundry minerals.

"The total number of persons employed in and about all the mines of the United Kingdom was 912,576, of whom 882,345 worked at the 3278 mines under the Coal Mines Act, and 30,231 at the 715 mines under the Metalliferous Mines Act."[1]

On the success of this work the whole industry of our country depends, and a misadventure would be attended with disaster unequalled in many respects by that of even a foreign invasion. In comparison with so colossal an undertaking as this, the administration of the Army is but relatively simple. Where, we well may ask, are the successes of national control which invite us to acquiesce in so great and so grave a risk? Again, we may well ask, where is the evidence of maladministration or injustice under present conditions, which either necessitate or justify such an experiment in the case of the United Kingdom?

[1] See p. 6 of General Report on Mines and Quarries, Cd. 3478 of 1907.

XVII

CONCLUSIONS

It will appear from the foregoing chapters that Socialism, as it is presented by its adherents to-day, is to a large extent merely doctrinal. Socialists place before the people certain vague and high-sounding ideals of the social and economic State for which they are contending, and strive to popularise those ideals by a body of specious, but wholly fallacious, doctrines, as typified by the Marxian theory of value. Practice, however, is not infrequently in conflict with theory, and the world but seldom runs true to preconceived doctrine. Socialism cannot, of course, be achieved by theorising. Socialism involves a fundamental social and economic change which can only be effected after the complete subversion and overthrow of existing systems and conditions. Before we can replace an old building with a new one, it is necessary to clear the site. What, then, is Socialism's constructive programme? The house-breakers are ready enough; where are the architects and their plans?

There are no plans. There are some vague architectural theories which take palatial promise on the lips of irresponsible amateur and unproven State-craftsmen; but beyond that there is nothing.

We believe that if we work on the architectural analogy the actual position will be made abundantly clear. As a people and as a country we are in business. It is vital that the continuance of our trade and commerce should not be interfered with for even a single day. We have some forty odd million human beings dependent on that trade and commerce. The problems which confront the Socialists are, in the main, two. How are they proposing to pull down our old premises and build up the new without necessitating a cessation in our undertaking? That is the first difficulty. The second is even more important. When the new premises are erected the old buildings will have ceased to exist. The new premises and the new machinery are to be in permanent use. We want plans and specifications. It must be proved that this new building, which is of a startlingly novel description, is one which will stand, and also is one in which our great business can successfully be conducted. More than this, the proposed machinery is of a nature which has never been tested. Will it work? The workers themselves are to labour under conditions wholly unprecedented. Will *they* work? Upon all of this Socialism is silent. Was there ever a heavier demand made upon credulity in all history?

Socialism, then, has no constructive programme.

Let us inquire into that. The revolutionary Socialists aim at the "rushing" of their scheme. They take it on trust, upon theory, and would impose it upon the nation at the first favourable opportunity. They believe themselves to be such

efficient house-breakers that they rashly imagine they will be equally successful in the matter of re-construction. We will allow them to wallow in their own optimism, and will turn to the evolutionaries. Their reply is "Wait—Wait." They passionately assure us that their theories are sound, and inform us that, in the time to come, some great master-mind will design plans which will square with them.

Meanwhile it is incontestable that one of two things must happen. Either reformers must stay their hand and allow social wrongs to cry in vain for redress, or sound legislation and administration which meet the necessities of the day will stifle the demand for Socialism. The evolutionary Socialists, however, seek to steer a midway course. They cannot, they dare not, allow the world's pain to be intensified by denial, and so they set out to give us their Socialism by instalments. In other words, they seek to pull the old premises down in sections and to extend the re-building over a considerable period of time. And, if you please, they overlook the fact that as a result trade is being most grievously interfered with, and that work is congested and made difficult in remote departments which are only indirectly affected. They forget, too, that capital is in consequence less inclined to embark upon new risks in this country, and in many cases is driven to other countries. They also fail to realise that the wage-earners are increasingly being thrown out of work. When after a little while the position has become acute, either the capitalists will say: "This sort of thing is intolerable;" or the

wage-earners will protest against the slowness of the change. Or perhaps, as likely as either, the latter will say that things went better in the old premises, and they will have no more to do with Socialism.

Even if the wit of man could devise a scheme which would make the transition stage possible, the difficulties inseparable from the control of the Socialist State when in being would still remain. Again, on the subject of the transition stage, the Socialists have no constructive policy.

In the preceding chapters we have examined the theories of Socialist production and distribution, and have furnished, we submit, abundant ground for the conclusion that the former would be disastrously diminished because of the total failure of the latter to accord with the natural requirements and conditions of life and human character. Further, we have shown that the promised abolition under the Socialist *régime* of class distinctions is wholly illusory, and that Socialism would merely substitute an official class for the existing governing and controlling class. In other sections we have given reason for the belief that so far from Socialism establishing a system of individual freedom, it would, in practice, involve a complete suppression of individual rights. We trust, too, that we have succeeded in demonstrating that Socialism would fail to successfully redress existing inequalities in wealth distribution; in that, under Socialism, with a diminished output, the whole people would be rendered poor and destitute. Yet, important as we claim that these conclusions are, we apprehend that the fact of the absence of a constructive policy will prove to most minds to be the

most arresting. Practical men and women in all walks of life will stand aghast at the truth that the callow ill-informed theorists who seek to subvert and annihilate the social system of centuries, and who demand of us that we entrust to them the welfare of our people and the control of our Empire, should ask us to vote for Socialism, to work for Socialism, and to establish Socialism—without as much as vouchsafing to the nation any practical scheme for the creation of a Socialist State, or of the conduct of affairs, when Socialism has been brought into being. The Empire, the lives and happiness of the millions of our fellow-countrymen and women, the industries of our land, the products of years of mental and bodily toil, the future of our children —all these are the stake with which the Socialists would gamble—and for what?

For the annihilation of private wealth, in order to win an equality of misery and of poverty; for the overthrow of personal freedom, so that the tyranny of officialdom might be firmly enthroned; for the humiliation and perversion of faith, of character, and of conduct. All these must be the inevitable concomitants of Socialism triumphant.

INDEX

ABOLITION of prostitution, Socialist claim, 395
Accidents, railway, 509
Agricultural holdings, statistics, 490
Agricultural returns, decreased land values, 467
Agriculture and Socialism, 474
Aliens, under Socialism, 321
Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, 23
American Socialist programme, international character, 122
Anarchism and lack of discipline, condemned by Socialist writer, 210
Anarchism and Socialism, connection, 113
Anarchists and religion, 338
Anarchist tendency in Socialist League, 15
Annihilation of rulers, &c., preached, 108
Anti-national character of Socialism, 119
Anti-patriotism and Socialism, 125
Architectural analogy, failure, 525
Army, the, and Socialism, 411
Army, the, Socialist fallacy, 312
Asceticism, success of communities due to; Socialists repudiate it, 159
Ateliers nationaux, 163
Atheism the aim of Socialism, 336
Australia, railway agitations, 517
Authority in industrial affairs, need of, 245

BALFOUR, Right Hon. A. J., M.P., prefatory letter, v
Belfast riots, 1907, Socialists and military, 413
Belgium, railway agitations, 517
Board of Agriculture, return of holdings, 1907, 490
Board of Trade Blue-book, total wages bill, 199; foreign investments, 200
Bonanza farms, U.S.A., 488
Bourgeois marriages and property, Socialist views, 377, 399
Bourgeois solution, peasant proprietors, Socialist objections, 457
Breslau Congress, 1895, and peasant proprietors, 459
Budget speech, 1907, Socialist "so-called solution," 177

CALCUTTA manager and American methods, 329
Canada, amplitude of land for cultivation, 463; agricultural prospects, 495
Canadian railways, small investors, 270
Canals and railways, 505
Cant allegations of Socialism as to woman, 396
Capital city, the, not the measure of the country, 283
Capital, Socialist definition, 6; cannot be abolished, 186; essential to production, 146
Capitalism abolished by Socialism, 306
Capitalists and landlords, Socialist errors, 447
Caxton Hall Concordat, 25
Celibacy necessary under Socialism, 407
Ceylon fisheries and State management, 333
Channel Islands, consolidation of holdings, failure, 485
Character and success, 242
Chartism, rise of, 11
Cheap goods and labour, fallacy, 328

Index

Chicago anarchist trial, 1886, Socialism and Anarchism, 115
Chicago Convention, 1904, programme, international character, 122
Children and married women under Socialism, 304
Children and parents. *See* the Family
Christian Socialism in England, 42
Christian Socialist Society, 44
Christian Socialists, 352, 364
Christian Social Union, 44
Christianity and Socialism, 336
Church, the, and Socialism, 339
Claims of Socialism, 135
Claims to land, Socialists', 469
Clarion article on religion, 349
Clarion organisations and method, 72
Class war and revolution, 101
Class, class war, "class-conscious," *only one* class, 204
Class, governing and labouring, 205
Coal royalties, Socialist fallacies, 519
Collectivism and disarmament, 426
Collectivism and State Socialism, 155
Collectivist State, principal features, 144
Commonwealth and employment, 207
Communism in England, history, 11
Communist manifesto on international character, 120
Communistic societies, lessons of, 156
Companies, statistics, 274
Companies wound up, return, 331
Compensation and expropriation, 91, 108; bogus cry, 442
Competition abolished by Socialism, 182; denounced by Socialists, 297; selects the fittest men, 244
Concentration of capital, Socialist error, 271
Conclusions, XVII., 525
Confiscatory designs on land, 439
Congested Districts Board, Ireland, working, 48
Constructive Socialist policy lacking, 137, 168, 528
Contradictory policies as to land, 443
Contrat Social (Rousseau), results of contempt by authorities, 118
Co-operation in agriculture, 493
Co-operative banking, 494
Co-operative movement and Socialism, 323
Cost of the monarchy, 133
Croquemitaine Céleste, le, 344

DANGERS of present division of land, 452
Deaths in workhouses and hospitals. *See* Pauperism
Declining railway dividends, 499
Deductions under Socialism, 302
Defects of State management, 249
Defensive forces and Socialism, 411
Definition of Socialism, 1
"Degenerate" authors of revolution, 112
Deity, the, and Socialism, 342
Delusive promises of Socialism, 204
Demagogues as leaders, 215
Denmark, agricultural experience, 486; extensive subdivision of soil, 493
Departmental Committee on railways, 504; on small holdings, report, on agricultural tenants, 478
Derby Conference of Independent Labour Party, and railways, 518
Despotism of Communism and Socialism, 214
Disarmament and Socialism, 426
Discipline *v.* Equality, 420
Discontent the agitator's weapons, 140
Distinctions between forms of Socialism, 4
Distress Committees, returns unreliable, 276
Dividends, railway, 499
Division of land, present dangers, 452
Divorce court under Socialism, 383
Doctrinaire nature of Socialism, 525
Doctrines of Henry George, 450
Domesday Book, new, statistics of freeholders, 436
Dumping, Socialist attitude, 303
Dynamite of ideas and of force, 108

EASTERN peoples, Socialism and Religion, 356
Economic position of woman, 392
Economic system, Socialism not merely, 7
Economy in working, absence of incentive to, 247
Education of children under Socialism, 404

Index

Election of Louis Napoleon due to dread of Socialism, 166
Emancipation of woman, 394
Emigration, only escape from Socialist State, 193; opposed by Socialists, 495
Empire, the. *See* International character
Employees and officials under Socialism, 191, 245
"England for the English," argument, 471
English Land Restoration League, origin, 17, 445
Environment, Socialist fallacy, 294
Equality and liberty, delusive promises, 204
Equality and patriotism, conflict of, 129
Equality, lines from *Locksley Hall*, *Sixty Years After*, 224
Equality of reward, 226; of opportunity, 235
Equality *v.* Discipline, 420
Estimates, varying, of national income, 258
Evolutionary Socialists, parties, 51; organisations, 52; and land taxation, 431; compensation, 442; "waiting" policy, 527
Exploitation and Socialism, 310
Expropriation and compensation, 91, 108, 442
External food-supplies, 480

FABIAN Society, origin, 16; organisation and aims, 52; method, 60
Fabian Tract No. 1, definition of capital, 6; No. 5, and national income, 267; No. 7, land nationalisation, 446; No. 127, on nationalisation of railways, 498
Factory system, basis of Socialist "constructive" policy, 477
Fallacies, Socialist, IX., 257
Family, the, and Socialism, 399
Featherstone Strike and then Home Secretary, 20
Fiscal Blue Book, total wages bill, 199; agricultural return of persons employed, 474
Fiscal Question and Socialism, 123
Food-supplies, external, England to become independent, 480
Force, gospel of, 105
Foreign investments of the United Kingdom, 200
Foreign trade and Socialism, 196
France, peasant proprietors and Socialism, 458
Frankfurt Social Democratic Congress, 1894, and agrarian policy, 459
Freedom, religious, suppressed by Socialism, 369
"Free Love." *See* the Family and Woman
Free Trade. *See* Fiscal Question
French property, depreciation of; National Debt due to Socialist experiments, 165
French Revolution, 1789, and expropriation, 93; and religion, 358
French Socialist experiment, 1848, 163
French Socialists and patriotism, 126; and defensive forces, 414
"Full product of labour" fallacy, 298
Fundamental fallacy of Socialism, 193

GAIN, incentive of, 312
General Election, 1895, working-class votes, 21; 1900, 22; 1906, 27
Geneva Anarchist Congress, 1882, and religion, 338
German and British railways, 507
German Socialists and defensive forces, 415
German Social Democrats and peasantry, 457; and agriculture, 478
Germany, success of co-operative banks, 494
Glasgow, Socialist leanings, 46
Glebæ ascripti, serfdom, Socialism means, 218
Gombeen-man and Irish peasants, warning, 493
Gotha Socialist Congress, 1875, international character, 121; recognition of proportional Collectivism, 147; and national militia, 413
Government departments, defects of, 141
Guild of St. Matthew, 43, 368

HALLE Congress, 1890, 478
Hammersmith Socialist Society, and municipalisation, 122

Index

Hearts of Oak investments, 436; annual meeting, 437
House duty, basis for calculation of income, 263
Hull Labour Conference, 1908, 34; opportunism, 360
Humanism, atheistical, Socialist creed, 337
Humanity under Socialism, 213

IGNORANCE of Socialists, 140
Imperialism and Socialism, 127
Impracticability of Socialism, warnings still needed, 116
Incas. *See* Peru
Income, national, fallacies, 257
Income Tax Committee, evidence, 259, 262
Increased expenditure necessary under Socialist State, 153
Independent Labour Party, formation, 20; method and rules, 62; and trade unions, 78; resolution as to religion, 347; resolutions on Socialism, religion and marriage, 389; on acquisition of land, 439
Individual ability of Socialism, 293
Industrial productiveness, diminution of, 174
Infant mortality, Socialist fallacies, 285
Inheritance and production, 181
Inland Revenue Commissioners, income from foreign investments, 201
Insufficiency of capital in agriculture, 494
Insurance companies and land values, 436
International and anti-national character of Socialism, IV., 119
International League, Socialist, dead but spirit living, 121
International, manifesto palliating crimes of Commune, 110
International Revolutionary Congress, 1881, 108
International Society, suggested London headquarters, 9, 117
Introductory chapter, 1
Invention, effect of Socialism on, 182
Inventors, great, without educational advantages, 240
Investors' profits, 330
Ireland and Socialism, 48
Irish Land Acts, need of caution, 493
Irish Nationalist Party and Socialism, 49
"Iron law of wages," 188
Italian journal on English workhouse, 150
Italy, railway abuses, 517

JOINT-COMMITTEE manifesto, on international character, 122
"Justification" of anti-national position, 130

KIRKDALE election, September 1907, attacks on Christianity, 346

"LABOUR" not sole source of wealth, 264
Labour Party, history, 18; and trade unions, 77; and Imperialism, 127
Labour Party, Independent. *See* Independent
Labour Representation Committee, formation, 22
Land Nationalisation Society, origin, 17; advocates land values' taxation, 441
Land reclamation, Socialist schemes futile, 494
Land Reform Union, 17
Land, Socialism and the, 429
Land values, taxation of, 432
Laplander and Lapland under "social revolution," 471
Latifundia, Roman, no argument for Socialism, 476
Leasehold enfranchisement, Socialist view, 430
"*L'état, c'est moi*," Socialist view, 221
Liberty and equality, delusive promises, VII., 204
Local Government Act, 1888, effects, 18
Local Government Board, returns of unemployed, 277
Local Taxation, Royal Commission. *See* Royal.
London Dock Strike, 1889, 19
London not the measure of England, 283
Luddites commended by Socialist writer, 325
Lyons Anarchist trial, 1883, Socialism and Anarchism, 115

MACHINERY and Socialism, 325
"Magic of Property," Socialism roots out, 475

Index

Majorities and minorities, 96
Management, Socialist theory of, 243
Manchester School, Socialist view, 124
Marriage and Socialism, 372
Married women and children under Socialism, 304
Materialism the gospel of Socialism, 351
Methods of rival Socialist bodies, 60
Middle class crowded out, fallacy, 257
Mines and Socialism, 496, 519
Mining, employment and output, figures, 523
Minorities and majorities, 96
Minority Report on Local Taxation, 432
Misstatements, Socialist, regarding land, 460
Modern Socialist movement, origin, 13
Modern Socialist Radical programme and land schemes, 430
Monarchy, the, and Socialism, 119; abolition proposed by S.D.F., 131
Money under Socialism, 148
Monopoly and Socialism, 293
"Monopoly of land" misrepresentations, 435, 461
"Monopoly," Socialist objection to family life, 400
Monster monopoly of Socialism, 295
Morning Post on the Hull conference, 34, 39, 40; London land values, 437
Mosely Industrial Commission, report, 274
Municipalisation and international character, joint-committee manifesto, 122

NANTES Congress, 1894, and peasant proprietors, 459
National income, fallacies, 257
Nationalisation of land, 431, 443; railways and mines, 496; objections, 510
Navy, the, and Socialism, 411, 422
Need for efficient defence, 424
New Age on prospects of Hull Conference, 36
New Christianity and Church, French system, 357

OFFICIALS and employees under Socialism, 191, 245
Old age pensions and life chance, 238
Opportunism displayed at Hull Congress, January 1908, 360
Opportunity, equality of, 235
Opposition suppressed by Socialism, 96
Origin of modern Socialist movement, 13
Owenite movement, 11

Pall Mall Gazette on French Socialists and revolt, 414
Pantisocratic schemes of Southey and Coleridge, 11
Papal encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, 45
Parents and children, rights and duties. *See* the Family
Paris Commune, 1871, object lesson, 109
Patriotism a barrier to Socialism, 128
Pauperism, Socialist fallacies, 278
Peasant proprietorship, Socialist view, 430
Perfectionist view of Communism, 383
Personal incentive and Socialism, 311
Peru, Socialist State, 161; with open doors, 403; downfall of, 427
Political dangers of railway nationalisation, 516
Poplar workhouse under Socialist management, 150
Population question, 405
Post Office and Socialists, 189
,, ,, Socialist argument, 251
Poverty and misery intensified by Socialism, 187
Poverty, Right Hon. Charles Booth's remarks, 282
Practice and theory of evolutionary Socialism, 98
Press, the, and Fabian tactics, 55; extermination of, consequences, 225
Private and State management contrasted, 333
Private property under Socialism, 154
Profit-sharing, results of, 248
Progress, Socialism hostile to, 184
,, or Reaction? VI., 167
Property, attacks on, 104
Proportional Collectivism, 146
Prostitution, Socialist claim to abolish, 395
Protection. *See* Fiscal Question

Index

Protectionist countries and "dear money," 494
Prudential Insurance Company and land values, 436

RADICAL organisations and Fabian tactics, 53
Raffeisen banks, 494
Railways. *See also* Post Office
Railways and Socialism, 496; of United Kingdom, cost, 497
Rates, railway, Socialist allegations, 511
Reaction or progress? 167
Reclamation of land, futile Socialist schemes, 494
Reform Act, 1832, effects, 11
Registrar-General, infant mortality figures, 285
Réhabilitation de la Chair, French doctrine, 384
Relations of Socialist parties and trade unions, 74
Religion and Socialism, 336
Republicans, Socialists are, 131
Rerum Novarum, Papal Encyclical, 45
Retail dealers and stores, Socialist policy, 272
Retrogression, Socialist fallacy, 334
Revolt, Socialist incitement to, 414
Revolution and class war, 101
Revolution, Socialism impossible without, 103
Revolutionary nature of Socialism, III., 87
Revolutionary Socialists, parties, 51; organisations, 79; "rushing" policy, 526
Reward, equality of, 226
Richer and poorer, allegation, 257; fallacy, 268
Roman latifundia, condemned by classic authors, 476
Royal Commission on Labour, evidence, 441; on Local Taxation, 432; evidence, 440; on Mining Royalties, report, 519
Royal Statistical Society, paper on decreased land values, 466
Royalties, mining, 519
Russian Empire and bureaucracy, 220

SCOTLAND and Socialism, 46
Scottish Emancipation League, 46
Scottish Land and Labour League, 46
Scottish Land Restoration Union, President's evidence, 440
Sexual relations. *See* Woman and The Family
Shakers, communities of, 157
Slave class advocated by Utopian writers, 214
Small Holdings Bill, 1907, Socialist opposition, 430
"So-called solution," Socialist, 177
Social Democratic Federation ("S.D.F."), origin, 14; and trade unions, 75; programme, 79; method, 83; international character, 119; and municipalisation, 122; and Fiscal Question, 123; and patriotism, 129; and monarchy, 131; and "citizen forces," 412
Social Democratic Party, extreme views of, 392
Socialisation of land, means of production, &c., 429, 443
Socialism, and Agriculture, XV., 474; and the defensive forces, XIII., 411; and the family, XI., 399; and the Fiscal Question, 123; and the land, XIV., 429; and monopoly, 293; and religion, X., 336; intensifies poverty and misery, 187
Socialist Conference, 1900, 24
Socialist ignorance of life and government, 140
Socialist International League, dead but spirit living, 121
Socialist League, history, 14
Socialist Party of Great Britain ("S.P.G.B."), 15; object, 84; manifesto on wealth, 265; of Ireland, 50
Socialist State, the, V., 135
Socialists on external food supplies, 480
Socialists, Christian. *See* Christian
Song-Book, Socialist, revolutionary verses, 113
Sparta, parents and children in, 409
Spinning-frame, Arkwright's, capital needed, 183
State and private management contrasted, 333
State industries, success of, and practicability of Socialism, 189

Index

State management and control of means of production, &c., 153
State management, defects of, 249
State Socialism *v.* Collectivism, 155
State, the Socialist, V., 135
Statist, The, on British capital in foreign countries, 200
Statistical abstract, agricultural holdings, 492
Statistics of foreign trade, 196
Statistics respecting agricultural holdings, 490
Subdivision of land a barrier to Socialism, 456
Subject races, our attitude towards, 97
Success, Socialist denunciation of, 242
Swedish infant mortality, compared with English, 286
Syndicalisme jaune, against State Collectivism, 224

TAFF VALE railway strike, 22
Tariffs, railway, 515
Taxation of land values, 432
Telegraphs. *See* Post Office
Telephone. *See* Post Office
Theory and practice of evolutionary Socialism, 98
Times, The, on Socialists and international solidarity, 197
Town Holdings Committee, "unearned increment," 467
Trades Disputes Bill, 1906, 41
Trade unions and political parties, relations, 74
Trade union returns unreliable, 276
Trades' Union Congress, 1874, 19; 1894, 21; leaders' overbearing conduct, 224
"Transition stage" fallacy, 87
Truck system enforced by Socialism, 320

ULTRA-INDIVIDUALISM a characteristic of Socialism, 400
Ultra-materialism, basic principle of Socialism, 351
"Unearned increment" and Socialism, 179; Socialism would extend, 295; misrepresentations, 435, 465
Unemployed, Socialist fallacies, 275
United Kingdom, Socialism in, II., 9; prosperity and commercial supremacy, 315; Socialism would weaken, 423; soil and stock-breeding superior to other countries, 486
United States, communistic groups, 158; prosperity and wages, 274; machinery and labour, 327; large and small farms, 488
Universal Socialism, results, 321
University and democracy, 239
Utility of mining royalties, 521
Utopias, Socialist, do not appeal to Socialists, 142

"VERGE of starvation," fallacy of phrase, 281

"WAGE slaves," Socialist fallacy, 289
Wages bill, *Fiscal Blue Book*, 199
Wages of Socialism, 317
War, Socialism and, 416
Warnings against neglect of opposition to Socialism, 116
Wealth and "labour," 264
Woman under Socialism, XI., 372. *See* also the Family

Printed by BALLANTYNE, HANSON & Co.
Edinburgh & London

Recent Publications

THE LABOUR IDEAL

A Series of Books on SOCIAL QUESTIONS *by Leaders of the "Labour" Movement.*

Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 1s. net each.

FROM SERFDOM TO SOCIALISM. By J. KEIR HARDIE, M.P.

THE SOCIALIST'S BUDGET. By PHILIP SNOWDEN, M.P.

LABOUR AND THE EMPIRE. By J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P.

THE SOCIALIST'S CHURCH. By STEWART D. HEADLAM.

THE WOMAN SOCIALIST. By ETHEL SNOWDEN.

THE SOCIALIST AND THE CITY. By FREDERICK W. JOWETT, M.P.

Crown 8vo, 320 pp., cloth, gilt top, 5s. net.

SCIENCE IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS. With Preface by the Right Hon. R. B. HALDANE, and Seven Essays, by M. E. SADLER, J. A. HOBSON, H. DE R. WALKER, V. V. BRANFORD, C. M. DOUGLAS, C. H. DENYER, J. E. HAND, Mrs. S. A. BARNETT.

Crown 8vo, cloth, 528 pages, 6s. net.

GOOD CITIZENSHIP. Essays on Social, Political, and Economic Problems, with Preface by the BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM.

Among the contributors are Canons Barnett and Scott-Holland; Archdeacon Wilson; Revs. Dr. Fry, Dr. Morrison, Atkinson, Bayne, Carter, Lilley, Powell, Rashdall; Hon. W. Reeves; Messrs. Theodore Dodd, L. Gomme, J. Hobson, G. W. E. Russell; Mrs. R. C. Phillimore; Misses Busk, Portal, and Wilson.

RUSKIN AT 1s.

Pott 8vo, cloth, gilt top, Monogram on side, 1s. each net. Leather limp, 1s. 6d. each net.

THE CROWN OF WILD OLIVE. On Work, Traffic, War, and the Future of England. 80*th Thousand.*

TIME AND TIDE. On Laws of Work. 41*st Thousand.*

UNTO THIS LAST. On the First Principles of Political Economy. 84*th Thousand.*

MUNERA PULVERIS. Essays on Political Economy. 19*th Thousand.*

Recent Publications

Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt top, 5s. net.

SKETCHES FROM LIFE IN TOWN AND COUNTRY. By EDWARD CARPENTER. With Photogravure Portrait.

Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt top, 6s.

MY SON AND I. By Mrs. M. H. SPIELMANN. With Frontispiece in colour, Title-page, Cover Design, and 9 full-page Illustrations by HUGH THOMSON.

Foolscap 4to, 5s. net.

S. GEORGE FOR MERRIE ENGLAND. By MARGARET H. BULLEY. Illustrated with 56 full-page Illustrations from the Old Masters.

Crown 8vo, cloth, 2s. net.

"DOWN WITH THE CHURCH." A Conspiracy Unmasked. By J. L. WALTON.

An armoury of facts from which the author endeavours to show the insincerity of the attack on Christian Education.

Crown 8vo, paper covers, 6d. net.

A PLEA FOR CHURCH SCHOOLS. By HAKLUYT EGERTON.

Church Times.—"The most complete statement of the Argument for Parents' Rights will be found in the 'Plea for Church Schools.'"

Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

OFFENCE NOT DEFENCE; OR, ARMIES AND FLEETS. By Capt. HOLMES WILSON, R.F.A.

Field-Marshal Earl ROBERTS says:—"I read it with great interest. It is a book that should be very generally read."

Viscount MILNER writes:—"It is a valuable contribution to the study of a question which is of the greatest national importance."

The *Pall Mall Gazette.*—"This is an admirable book; it may without exception be described as the very strongest appeal yet put forward, within such a compass, for a National Army on a large scale."

113059

SoS
C3374 The case against

DATE	N
Dec. 11/56	H.Pullen
Jan 8/59	S.Dud

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE